

Jewish, Christian, and Classical Exegetical Traditions in Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus

Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae

TEXTS AND STUDIES OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LIFE AND LANGUAGE

Editor in Chief

D.T. Runia

Editorial Board

J. den Boeft
B.D. Ehrman
K. Greschat
J. Lössl
J. van Oort
C. Scholten

VOLUME 141

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/vcs*

Jewish, Christian, and Classical Exegetical Traditions in Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus

Translation Technique and the Vulgate

By

Matthew A. Kraus



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 978-9004-34297-2 (hardback)

ISBN 978-9004-34300-9 (e-book)

Copyright 2017 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

*To Sissy, Jacob, Shirah, Micah, and Eden:
imagine Dei facitis mihi sanctuarium et habito in medio eorum*



Contents

Preface XI

Abbreviations and Text Editions XII

Introduction: Jerome and Translation Technique 1

- 1 Literal and Free Translations 2
- 2 Translation Technique and Exegesis 4
- 3 Translation Technique of the Septuagint and Translation Studies 8
- 4 The Plan of This Book 13

1 *Recentiores*-Rabbinic Philology and Vg Exodus 15

- 1.1 Life and Work 15
- 1.2 Jerome, Jewish Learning, and Biblical Scholarship 19
- 1.3 Recent Trends in Hieronymian Studies 23
- 1.4 Approaches to the Vulgate 33
- 1.5 Summary 41

2 Translation Technique of the Vulgate 43

- 2.1 Preliminary Remarks on Method 43
- 2.2 The Sense of *Sensus* 45
- 2.3 Translation Technique 50
 - 2.3.1 *Literalisms and Transliterations* 50
 - 2.3.2 *New and Unusual Meanings* 51
 - 2.3.3 *Free Renderings* 51
 - 2.3.3.1 Etymologies 51
 - 2.3.3.2 Clarifications 51
 - 2.3.3.3 Intertextuality 52
 - 2.3.3.4 Relationship to Greek Tradition 52
 - 2.3.3.5 Idiomatic Latin 52
 - 2.3.3.5.1 *Classical Latin* 53
 - 2.3.3.5.2 *Christian Latin* 54
- 2.4 Identifying an Interpretive Rendering 54
- 2.5 Conclusion 55

3 Jerome, the Hebrew Text, and Hebrew Grammar 61

- 3.1 A Grammatical Approach to Translation 61
- 3.2 *Lectio* 64

3.3	Enarratio	67
3.3.1	<i>Ambiguity</i>	70
3.3.2	<i>Variatio</i>	71
3.3.3	<i>Emphasis</i>	77
3.3.4	<i>Grammar/Linguistics</i>	79
3.3.5	<i>Periphrasis</i>	82
3.3.6	<i>Historia</i>	83
3.3.7	<i>Figures/Metaphor</i>	84
3.4	Emendatio	89
3.4.1	<i>Clause Connectors</i>	93
3.4.2	<i>Particles</i>	95
3.4.3	<i>Simplification</i>	100
3.5	Summary and Conclusion: Translation Theory and the Historical Moment	102
4	The Critical Use of the Septuagint and Versions	105
4.1	Introductory Remarks	105
4.2	Jerome's Greek <i>Vorlagen</i>	107
4.3	Jerome's View of the Septuagint and Versions	108
4.4	Jerome's <i>Recentiores</i> Translation Technique	112
4.5	Textual Analysis	116
4.5.1	<i>Rejection</i>	117
4.5.1.1	Rejection of Semantics and Syntax of the Translations	117
4.5.1.1.1	<i>Semantics</i>	117
4.5.1.1.2	<i>Syntax</i>	118
4.5.1.1.3	<i>Additions, Subtractions, and Rearranged Word Order</i>	118
4.5.2	<i>Acceptance of the Septuagint and Versions</i>	119
4.5.2.1	Septuagint	119
4.5.2.2	Vetus Latina	121
4.5.2.3	Aquila	124
4.5.2.4	Symmachus	126
4.5.2.5	Theodotion	126
4.5.2.6	Septuagint and <i>Recentiores</i>	126
4.5.3	<i>Critical Utilization of the Greek Tradition</i>	128
4.6	Conclusion	134

5 Jerome's Exegetical Translation Technique and Late Antiquity	135
5.1 Possibilities and Problems	140
5.2 Theological Interpretations	147
5.3 <i>Historia</i>	157
5.4 Legal Exegesis	168
5.5 Theology and Scholarship	172
5.6 Conclusion	175
6 The Late Antique Bible and Classical Tradition	176
6.1 Preliminary Remarks	176
6.2 Method	182
6.3 Exegetical Traditions	184
6.3.1 <i>Legal Latin Exegesis</i>	187
6.3.2 <i>Narrative Latin Exegesis</i>	191
6.3.3 <i>Latinizations</i>	195
6.3.3.1 Biblical Intertextuality	196
6.3.3.2 Technical Vocabulary	197
6.3.4 <i>Classical and Late Antique Context</i>	207
6.3.4.1 Recognition or Revelation?	207
6.3.4.2 Passover as Conversion?	209
6.3.4.3 Chosenness and <i>Peculium</i>	209
6.3.4.4 Adoption	210
6.3.4.5 Oddities	211
6.4 Conclusion	212
7 Conclusion	213
7.1 Late Antiquity	215
7.2 Jewish Studies, Patristics, and Biblical Studies	218
Bibliography	223
Index of Modern Authors	245
Index of Ancient Sources	247
Index of Subjects	258
Index of Words	263

Preface

This first book-length study in English on Jerome's translation of a book from the Pentateuch from Hebrew to Latin offers a glimpse into a scholar-translator at work. Philologist, biblical exegete, Christian intellectual, conversant with Hebrew and Jewish traditions, polemicist, and student of Classical Latin style and literature, Jerome is a unique product of a unique period in Late Antiquity. The Vulgate version of Exodus is particularly suited for this study because it is often neglected and the Book of Exodus includes narrative, poetic, and legal materials. As one of the last biblical texts that Jerome translated, it reflects his skills as a biblical translator at their peak.

I have long been interested in the interaction between Judaism and Hellenism and the history of biblical interpretation. Studying Jerome has enabled me to combine these interests and, as it were, eavesdrop on a conversation about scriptural texts between Jewish, Christian, and Classical literary traditions. It is no simple task, so with deep gratitude I acknowledge those who have provided support, encouragement, and perspective: Adam Kamesar, who introduced me to Jerome, Sabine MacCormack z"l, Elliot Ginsburg, Ludwig Koenen, James Porter, David Potter, Kerry Christensen, Meredith Hoppin, Vassiliki Panoussi, David Porter z"l, Oded Irshai, Hillel Newman, Andrew Cain, Rivka Ulmer, Lieve Teugels, all my colleagues at the University of Cincinnati including Gila Safran Naveh, Ari Finkelstein, and Michal Raucher, The Yad Hanadiv/Beracha Foundation, The Oakley Center for the Humanities and Social Sciences, and the University of Cincinnati Taft Research Center. Angela Roskop Erisman's assistance with the manuscript was invaluable, and I am especially grateful to the manuscript's anonymous readers and Tessa Schild, Loes Schouten, and Saskia van der Knaap at Brill for shepherding this book to publication. My greatest appreciation is for my wonderful life-partner and children whose liveliness and sustenance have made this day arrive.

Abbreviations and Text Editions

Abbreviations generally follow *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2014). Those that cannot be found there are listed here.

ACCS	<i>Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture</i> . 11 vols. Edited by Thomas C. Oden. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000–2010
CHB	<i>The Cambridge History of the Bible</i> . 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975
Coll.	<i>Collatio Legum Romanarum et Mosaicarum</i>
Collatio	<i>Mosaicarum et Romanarum Legum Collatio</i> . By M. Hyamson. London: Oxford University Press, 1913
<i>Galil.</i>	Julian, <i>Against the Galileans</i>
IH	<i>iuxta Hebraeos</i>
ILXX	<i>iuxta Septuaginta</i>
JSB	<i>The Jewish Study Bible</i> . Edited by Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004
LS	<i>A Latin Dictionary; founded on Andrew's edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary</i> . Revised and enlarged by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956
OLD	<i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> . Edited by P. G. W. Glare. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
<i>Quaest. Exod.</i>	Theodoret, <i>Quaestiones in Exodum</i> in <i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Graeca</i> . Edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857–1887
RevÉtLat	<i>Revue des Études Latines</i>
<i>RivFilolIstrClass</i>	<i>Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica</i>
Strack-Stemberger	<i>Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash</i> By H. L. Strack and Günter Stemberger. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996
Vg	Vulgate
VL	Vetus Latina
Wevers	John William Wevers, ed. <i>Exodus, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum</i> 2.1. Edited by John William Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991
α'	Aquila
σ'	Symmachus
θ'	Theodotion

I use the following editions for biblical texts: for MT, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967–77); Wevers for LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; for VL, *Biblorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae seu Vetus Italica*, ed. P. Sabatier (Rheims, 1739–43; Paris, 1751) and the apparatus of Wevers; and for IH, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, ed. R. Weber, et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969) and *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem... cura et studio monachorum abbatis pontificiae S. Hieronymi in urbe ordinis S. Benedicti edita* 1–16 (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1926–1981).

Jerome's letters are cited from the text of Hilberg (CSEL 54–56). His other works are cited from CCSL wherever possible, elsewhere from *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne (ed. J.-P. Migne; Paris: Migne, 1844–1904). The texts of Targum Onkelos, Targum Yerushalmi, and Rashi come from *Miqra'ot Gedolot*, otherwise known as the Second Rabbinic Bible. Edited by Jacob ben Hayyim and published in Venice in 1524, it has been frequently reprinted, for example, as *Mikraot gedolot ha-Maor: hamishah humshe Torah* (Jerusalem: Mekhon ha-Maor, 1990). Exodus Rabbah is cited from the Vilna edition of 1887. Wherever possible, other rabbinic texts are cited from modern critical editions which are listed in Strack-Stemberger.

Translations are mine unless otherwise noted. I sometimes render the Hebrew in “translate” in order to highlight the semantic and syntactic issues in the text.

Introduction: Jerome and Translation Technique

The seventh-century archbishop and scholar, Isidore of Seville, provides a brief description of Jerome's translation of the Bible from Hebrew to Latin, commonly known as the Vulgate (Vg):

Also the elder Jerome, an expert in three languages, converted the same Scriptures into Latin elocution, and made the transfer eloquently. His translation is deservedly preferred over the others. For it has a tighter grip on the words, it reads more lucidly because of the clarity of expression and is a more accurate translation in so far as it has been rendered by a Christian.¹

Although accurately referring to linguistic ability, Latin eloquence, improvement over the Old Latin, and Hebrew and Christian accuracy, the notice has its limitations. Because Isidore subordinates the characterization of the translator and translation to defending his own preference for the Vulgate, he contributes to the invisibility of Jerome as a translator.² We do not even see the title that Jerome assigned to his work, identified simply as a translation *iuxta Hebraeos* 'according to the Hebrews' (IH) and *Hebraica veritas* 'Hebrew truth'.³ These terms orient us toward the process of translation, while the term Vulgate (the "common" version) points to the product and its reception. Such a focus deflects interest in the technique of the translator to a general evaluation of the final product based on the categories of "good" and "bad," or "accurate" and "inaccurate." This study adopts a different approach to the Vulgate. I examine the process of translation by closely analyzing the interpretive moves made by Jerome for a particular biblical text, the book of Exodus. Here we see the translator at work, interacting with the Hebrew language, the Greek biblical versions, and Jewish, Christian, and Classical exegetical tradition.

1 *Presbyter quoque Hieronymus trium linguarum peritus ex Hebraeo in Latinum eloquium easdem Scripturas convertit, eloquenterque transfudit. Cuius interpretatio merito ceteris antefertur; nam est et verborum tenacior, et perspicuitate sententiae clarior atque, utpote a Christiano, interpretatio verior* (Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies* 6.4.5).

2 For the classic study on the concept of "invisibility," see Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2008).

3 While the precise meanings of these terms are unclear, this study provides extensive information on what it means to translate according to the Hebrew. In this book, I use *iuxta Hebraeos* (IH) and Vulgate (Vg) interchangeably.

The core argument of this book is twofold: First, Jerome applies a *recentiores*-rabbinic philology as his translation technique for Vg Exodus which results in a number of exegetical renderings. Second, the method and results of the *iuxta Hebraeos* reflect his late antique context. The term “*recentiores*-rabbinic philology” was coined by Adam Kamesar to describe Jerome’s approach to the Hebrew text utilized in the *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* (QH_G).⁴ This approach combines Classical and Antiochene grammatical principles (philology) with analysis of the Septuagint, Old Latin, and versions (the *recentiores*: Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotian) in dialogue with rabbinic traditions. Since the *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* functions as an ancillary to Jerome’s translation of the Bible “according to the Hebrews” (*iuxta Hebraeos*), we must consider whether he applies this technique to the Vulgate. To date, no one has examined whether Jerome utilized the method developed in the *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* to his translation of the book of Exodus.⁵

Recent work on translation technique in Septuagint studies correlates well with this analysis of the process behind Vg Exodus because it clarifies the significance of exegetical renderings for understanding the character of a translator and translation. Three areas of translation technique are comparable. First, there has been an effort to articulate precise criteria to differentiate between free and literal translations. Second, these criteria have been utilized to determine whether a rendering depends on a literal technique, a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the Masoretic Text, or an exegetical rendering. Third, the work on translation technique in the Septuagint (LXX) has stimulated new synergies between translation studies and Septuagint studies.

1 Literal and Free Translations

James Barr, Emanuel Tov, and the so-called Finnish school (Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, Raija Sollamo, and Anneli Aejmelaeus) have been seminal in establishing criteria that distinguish between literal and free translation. To be more

4 Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993).

5 In fact, the only work specifically focusing on Vg Exodus is a brief essay by David L. Everson, “The Vetus Latina and the Vulgate of the Book of Exodus,” in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 370–86. He compares proper nouns, the renderings of יִסַּךְ with the infinitive, וַיֹּאמֶר, בֵּן . . . בֵּן, and hypotaxis in the Old Latin and Vg Exodus and concludes that Vg Exodus is much freer than the Old Latin. He does not consider the translation in relation to QH_G.

accurate, as Barr astutely notes, since literalism is a technique while free translation is not a “tangible method,” it is impossible to establish precise criteria for “free” beyond not meeting the criteria for “literal.”⁶ Barr identifies six types of literalness:⁷

1. division into elements and segments (i.e., constituent elements in single Hebrew word—conjunction, preposition, noun or verb, pronominal suffix have equivalent representation in Greek); this is the most identifiable feature of a literal technique;⁸
2. sequence of these elements (i.e., word order);
3. quantitative (additions or subtractions in target text);
4. consistency and non-consistency in rendering vocabulary or Vorlage;
5. accuracy in translating semantic equivalents;
6. how Hebrew language is imitated (i.e., does translation use Greek that sounds like the Hebrew equivalent and does it represent etymologies?).⁹

Such a typology is particularly useful because it clarifies various degrees of literalness in translations and reveals that a translation can be free in one area and literal in another. Freedom and literalness can co-exist.¹⁰ In contrast to Tov and his followers who employ statistical assessment of the presence of the various criteria for literalness, the Finnish school associated with Soisalon-Soininen, Sollamo, and Aejmelaeus explores different degrees of freedom.¹¹ Literalness may be subject to statistical analysis, but not freedom because it is revealed in exceptions to literalness.¹² Both Tov and the Finnish school

6 James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, MSU 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 281. Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 3rd ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 26–27 defines degrees of freeness by the extent that criteria for literalism are absent. See pp. 6–7 below.

7 Barr, *Typology*, 294.

8 Barr, *Typology*, 303.

9 Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, “Content-Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique,” in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Factagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D)*, Wuppertal 23–27. Juli 2008, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 359–60.

10 Barr, *Typology*, 280; Ausloos and Lemmelijn, “Content-Related Criteria,” 359.

11 Emanuel Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 18–27; Ausloos and Lemmelijn, “Content-Related Criteria,” 361.

12 The CATSS database is quite useful for quantitative assessments of literalness that focus on semantic features while the qualitative approach based on freedom of the Finnish

originally refined the study of translation technique in the interests of textual criticism since a free rendition from a literal translator more likely reflects a non-Masoretic *Vorlage* than a free rendition from a more independent translator.¹³ In addition to its value for textual criticism, however, highlighting the free renditions reveals the character of individual translators.¹⁴ For example, Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn have identified two approaches to the study of translation technique: as an object of study in itself, starting from the assumption that the translator has a particular method and then analyzing the translation to discover this method, and as a “method of research into the linguistic phenomena in the translation” which requires the consideration of various elements that may have influenced the translation process.¹⁵ Rather than assuming that the translation technique is 100% recoverable, adopters of this second method posit multiple techniques available to the translator, all of which require consideration. Ausloos and Lemmelijn, therefore, advocate a third approach, a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis, whose value emerges by concentrating on the content areas of etiologies, technical terminology, and hapax legomena. Since these content areas especially generate tensions between the source text (ST) and target language (TL), how the translator handles these phenomena in the target text (TT) offers a better sense of the translation technique than the treatment of general linguistic and grammatical features.¹⁶

2 Translation Technique and Exegesis

Extending the work of Barr, Tov, and the Finnish school, W. Edward Glenny considers the examination of translation technique of LXX Amos a prerequisite to the identification of exegetical renderings.¹⁷ He follows Aejmelaus and

school focuses on the rendition of particular Hebrew grammatical features such as the degree of hebraizing compared to the Greek idiom; see *ibid.*, 363–65.

13 *Ibid.*, 362. Statistics of literalness cannot help explain individual textual variants which could be due to the *Vorlage* or translation technique.

14 *Ibid.*, 361.

15 *Ibid.*, 367.

16 *Ibid.*, 368–72.

17 W. Edward Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*, VTSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2008). Additional works on exegetical renderings in the Septuagint include Jennifer Mary Dines, “The Septuagint of Amos: A Study in Interpretation” (Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1991); Aaron W. Park, *The Book of Amos as Composed and Read in Antiquity*, StBibLit 37 (New York: Lang, 2001); Arie Van

Timothy Mclay in distinguishing between translation technique or “research which takes as its point of departure the relationship between the translation and the *Vorlage*”¹⁸ and the translation’s theology (*Tendenz*) which refers to “those instances in which the historical context of the translator exerted a strong enough influence [on the translator] that the translation reflects a reapplication or new understanding of the text.”¹⁹ “Translation technique has to do ‘with the ways in which the Greek scribes translated the Hebrew Scriptures’”²⁰ and addresses how literally or freely a translation handles morphology, lexicology, and syntax.²¹ Because it can be difficult to account for translation shifts, Glenny takes a maximalist approach allowing for all possible explanations of differences between the MT and LXX—different *Vorlagen*, mis-translations or misreading of Hebrew, translation technique, and transcription history, as well as exegesis.²² He also goes so far as to suggest that mistakes, guesses, and exegesis could be part of the translation technique.²³

As a result, Glenny identifies two main approaches to translation technique in the Septuagint: textual and exegetical. The textual approach assumes that the translator, like a dragoman, seeks to be as faithful as possible and so differences more likely point to the *Vorlage*, not manipulation of the original.²⁴ According to the exegetical perspective, the translator is like a scribe who brought his knowledge of reading and interpretation of scriptures to translation

der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*, VTSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 1998); David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66*, JSOTSup 318 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001); and James Karol Palmer, “Not Made With Tracing Paper”: Studies in the Septuagint of Zechariah” (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 2004).

- 18 Anneli Aejmelaus, “What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique,” in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*, ed. Bernard A. Taylor; Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 532.
- 19 R. Timothy Mclay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 46.
- 20 Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 1 (citing Mclay, *Use*, 39).
- 21 Literalness or freeness can be measured statistically or formally. Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 1 n. 2 prefers the Finnish approach to the statistical approach.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 3.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 3 n. 15.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 6–7. This approach is associated with the ahistorical and non-theological method of the Finnish school. Glenny notes that the focus on textual criticism steered scholars away from studying the Septuagint as its own document (15) rather than as a “free-standing Greek religious document” with an “independent voice,” citing S. E. Porter, “Septuagint/Greek Old Testament,” *DNTB* 1099–1106, esp. 1103.

“and applied midrashic, proto-Rabbinic exegetical techniques to the text.”²⁵ The exegetical method can be considered a translation technique because it defines “faithful” not as philological accuracy but as a reflection of the true meaning of the text.²⁶ It is to be preferred to the atomistic approach because an exegetical rendition considers context, is easier to identify, and illuminates the historical situation of the translator.²⁷ While valorizing the exegetical technique, he does adopt the more conservative tendency of Tov and John William Wevers who posit a textual rationale for an exegetical rendition only if a variant exists that can testify to a different *Vorlage*.²⁸

The results of Glenny’s approach are illuminating. Not only does he identify features of literalism in LXX Amos such as word order and quantitative representation of constituent elements, he also notes a degree of freedom in rendering syntactic equivalents. The translator of LXX Amos:

was not concerned about always representing the constituent elements in his source text (segmentation), and often the individual elements in his *Vorlage* are not represented in the form of most every class of words including infinitive constructs, infinitive absolutes, participles, genitives, verbs, and nouns.²⁹

Freedom can also be observed in how the translator of LXX Amos renders difficult and unknown words. Strategies include transliteration, contextual guesses, contextual manipulation of consonants, reliance on parallelism, general word for specific term, and etymological renderings. Even though oriented toward a literal translation, the translator has the freedom to select from a number

25 Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 7–8.

26 Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 8. Here context is crucial: the readership may expect an exegetical rendition.

27 Easily recognizable exegetical categories include: “make information explicit, make information general or specific, use one component of meaning, use dynamic referent equivalents, use stylistic equivalents (or variants), give figurative extension of meaning, use figure of speech (synecdoche and idiom), make transformations (active-passive, and active-causative), and restructuring discourse to make sense” (ibid., 18). The exegetical character of a translation “reveals something of the theological, cultural, and partisan leanings of himself and his community” (ibid., 92, citing Dines, “Septuagint of Amos”).

28 Ibid. 9–10. The Finnish school more readily posits a different *Vorlage*.

29 Ibid., 68. According to Glenny, the translator also was not concerned about stereotypical word equivalents and may have been influenced by Greco-Roman *variatio* to make the text more rhetorically attractive.

of options for a literal rendition.³⁰ Statistically measuring literalness can thus underdetermine the dynamic character of a translation.³¹ “Translation technique cannot be measured. It must be described, instead, and described from as many angles as possible, with as many criteria as possible.”³² Thus, a free rendition can be explained in a number of ways: translation technique, the *Vorlage*, or theology. Glenny advocates for multiple explanations.³³ His work is methodologically sound because it takes into consideration the *Vorlage* and direct interaction between the translator and Hebrew text and Greek language (translation technique) before considering exegetical renderings.³⁴ Nevertheless, his claims that certain renderings reflect anti-Syrian and anti-Samaritan bias, eschatological references, concerns about gentiles and messianism remain speculative.³⁵ Caution in identifying exegetical renditions is necessary and it is not unusual for a scholar to reject an exegetical explanation despite entertaining its possibility.³⁶

30 Ibid., 71–105.

31 While one can measure literalness by consistency, a free translation can also show consistency. Also, statistical analysis does not consider lexical equivalence or context which can also explain a difference (ibid., 38; see also 43).

32 Anneli Aejmelaus, “What We Talk About,” 547.

33 Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 149.

34 Such is the method endorsed by Staffan Olofsson, *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version*, ConBOT 57 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 2: “If the linguistic and translation technical study could not give an adequate explanation to the translation the possibilities of theological motivation for the rendering must be investigated.”

35 E.g., while concluding that the renditions of Amos 4:5 and 6:1 are the “clearest references” to Samaritan religious leaders and Seleucid Hellenizers in Samaria, respectively, Glenny discusses the specific cases in more guarded terms: “They read a law outside” (Amos 4:5) is vague and certainly not a clear reference to Samaritans. Amos 6:1 is already anti-Samaritan (“Woe . . . to those who trust in the mountain of Samaria”), while τοῖς ἐξουθενουῦσιν ‘those who set at naught’ for השאננים could refer to Hellenizers or Seleucids in Jerusalem or simply read the Hebrew as a deverbative from אֵין ‘there is not’ (Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 166–71). One exception is the use of παντοκράτωρ for צבאות which does reflect contemporary theology (ibid., 186–89). This term happens to be the norm for the LXX Minor Prophets.

36 See Olofsson, *Translation Technique*, 28–49 (“The Translation of Jer 2:18 in the Septuagint. Methodical, Linguistic and Theological Aspects”) and 67–85 (“The Crux Interpretum in Ps. 2:12”). Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement 124 (Boston: Brill, 2008) attributes LXX Isaiah to a translator informed by Alexandrian grammatical traditions, not a contemporizing theologian.

Glenny has an important discussion about five interdependent presuppositions of the study of translation technique that, as we shall see, are relevant to the Vulgate.³⁷ First, translation technique is descriptive of how a translator renders the source text into the target language, not evaluative of a translation's quality. Second, since translation technique is synchronic, not diachronic, the context of the translator and audience must be considered. Third, the translator has a particular understanding of the source text's and target text's *langue* (the abstract language system) to be distinguished from the *parole* (the specific manifestation) which is directed toward the audience of the target text. Translation technique must be studied from the *parole*.³⁸ Fourth, translation technique involves close comparative analysis of the particular structures of the source and target languages. Finally, translation technique "takes the source language as its point of departure," meaning that the use of a particular construction in the target text sheds little light on translation technique without reference to the source text.

3 Translation Technique of the Septuagint and Translation Studies

Such general assumptions suggest a natural connection between translation studies and Septuagint studies. Until recently, however, the interaction between these two fields has been minimal.³⁹ The fields have begun to find common ground in the use of descriptive translation studies, the concept of translational norms, and theorizing about identification of exegetical renderings. Descriptive translation studies, particularly associated with Gideon Toury, calls for a comprehensive descriptive framework based on a distinction between text production and text reception.⁴⁰ The aim of descriptive translation studies

is to produce systematic accounts—both comprehensive descriptions and feasible explanations—of the interdependencies believed to obtain

37 Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 4–5, following McLay, *Use*, 61–63.

38 In other words, the source text is not the starting point because source text/source language cannot predict the actual expression in the target text. Study of the style of *parole* relative to the target language, however, is not relevant to translation technique.

39 Theo A. W. Van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*, CBET 47 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 2–5.

40 Albert Pietersma, "LXX and DTS: A New Archimedian Point for Septuagint Studies?," *BIOCS* 39 (2006): 11.

between (1) *contexts, or sociocultural circumstances*, (2) *translation processes* (or translator's strategies), and (3) *translation products*, first and foremost texts and elements thereof.⁴¹

"Analysis of the product" or "discourse analysis" to identify the "process"—in other words, translation technique—is joined with examining "function,"—in other words, "the prospective cultural position of the translation"—for a full description of a translation.⁴² According to Toury,

this principle [of function determining product, which in turn governs process] does not lose any of its validity when the position occupied by a translation in the target culture, or its ensuing functions, happen to differ from the ones it was initially "designed" to have; e.g., when the translation of a literary work, intended to serve as a literary text too and translated in a way which should have suited that purpose, is nevertheless rejected by the target literary system, or relegated to a position which it was not designed to occupy. In fact, one task of descriptive studies in translation may well be to confront the position which is *actually* assumed by a translation with the one it was *intended* to have, and draw the necessary conclusions.⁴³

Toury's general observation applies well to Septuagint studies because we know more about the reception of the Septuagint than we do about its production.⁴⁴ This makes description of the process of the translation of the Septuagint more challenging. Two crucial features of the "translation event" of the Septuagint, the socio-historical context that produced individual translators of the Septuagint and the place immediately occupied by the translations, can only be surmised. Toury's general observation particularly applies to the Septuagint: "However, once over, the act of translation will have completely vanished, often leaving no trace other than a linguistic product, which is thus the only real clue to the act," and so reconstructions of the translation

41 Gideon Toury, "A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?," *BIOSSCS* 39 (2006): 13–25.

42 Pietersma, "LXX and DTS," 10.

43 Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Benjamins Translation Library 4 (Amsterdam; John Benjamins, 1995), 14.

44 Pietersma, "LXX and DTS," 6 mentions the Letter of Aristeeas as case in point because it provides more information about the cultural position of the Greek Bible than about its translation technique.

technique are “tentative.”⁴⁵ For example, we can only guess at whether typical causes of literalness—such as poor knowledge of the source language, the audience’s ignorance of the target language or source language, the type of source text, the experience of the translator, time-pressure, orality, social preference, or tradition of literalness—apply to any LXX translator.⁴⁶ Some scholars have argued that we at least can hypothesize that as, a product of Hellenistic Egypt, the translators of the Septuagint may have been familiar with the grammatical and exegetical traditions of Alexandrian scholarship and ancient translation theory.⁴⁷

In the absence of specific information about the Septuagint’s production, therefore, theoretical models for the general features of translation will be more helpful to identifying the process of the LXX translators. A translation may have obligatory and non-obligatory shifts. The obligatory shifts are necessary products of translational norms while non-obligatory shifts may result from exegesis or the style of the target language. Thus, the Septuagint is primarily a translation, not exegesis, because it adheres to the principle of isomorphism, a norm of formal equivalency.⁴⁸ The obligatory shifts are the stylistic differences between normal Greek and the Greek of the Septuagint. Because of the cultural place of the source text (the Bible), it is sufficient for the Septuagint to meet a standard of linguistic acceptability, not stylistic acceptability.⁴⁹ It should be noted, however, that the norm of isomorphism functions as predominant preference, not universal law.⁵⁰ This suggests that the occasional instances of non-obligatory shifts can play a special role in highlighting the unique characteristics of the translator and translation technique. The Septuagint can also shed light on translation theory. Relying on Toury’s categories of universals, Sollamo argues that the universal norms of interference (“influence of the source language on the target language”), explicitation (making the implicit explicit), atypical lexical patterning and underrepresentation of target language specific items are confirmed in the Septuagint.⁵¹ Lengthening, standardization, reduction of

45 Toury, “Handful,” 15, 22.

46 Toury, “Handful,” 23. Lack of information about the production of the LXX is well-known. Toury provides a more precise taxonomy of our ignorance.

47 See Troxel, *LXX Isaiah*, 290–91 and Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 25–54.

48 Nouns are rendered as nouns, verbs as verbs, prepositions as prepositions, etc. See Cameron Boyd-Taylor, “Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot,” *BIOSSCS* 39 (2006): 42, 45–46.

49 Ibid., 37–40.

50 Ibid., 42.

51 Raija Sollamo, “Translation Technique and Translation Studies: The Problem of Translation Universals,” in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint*

complex narrative voices and reduction of repetition, however, can be found in the Septuagint, but there is no evidence of their universality.⁵² Interference thus seems to be the primary universal in the case of the Septuagint, and universal norms are probabilities not laws.

Two additional points regarding translational norms merit attention. First, norms can apply to both a literal and free translation. A more literal translator exhibits “regularity of performance,” typically rendering a phrase in the same way, while a freer translator demonstrates a “regularity of system,” regularly drawing on various equivalents.⁵³ Second, Sollamo notes an illuminating distinction between S-universals (based on the relationship between source text and target text) and T-universals (based on the relationship between translation and T-language).⁵⁴ These two categories nicely correspond to the study of translation technique and translation function.

The last point of intersection between Septuagint and translation studies, one particularly germane to this book, addresses the question “how can we recognise and describe interpretative elements in early translations?”⁵⁵ Taking this question as his starting point, Theo A. W. Van der Louw, in his book, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*, reaches similar methodological conclusions to mine. Namely, the approaches to translation studies that examine the specific character and context of the translator; the general social, historical, and cultural context of the translator and translation; and the taxonomy of transformations are particularly relevant for analyzing ancient biblical translation.⁵⁶ In addition, one must rule out low-level explanations for a transformation such

and *Cognate Studies*, Ljubljana, 2007, ed. Melvin K. H. Peters, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 55 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 346–47.

52 Ibid., 347.

53 Ibid., 341.

54 Sollamo (“Translation Technique,” 340) is following Andrew Chesterman, “Hypotheses about Translation Universals,” in *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, ed. Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjaer, and Daniel Gile (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2004), 1–13. Potential S-universals are lengthening, interference, standardization, dialect normalization, reduction of complex narrative voices, and explicitation, while potential T-universals are simplification, conventionalization, untypical lexical patterning, underrepresentation of target language-specific items, conventionalization, and less use of complex grammar of the target language (Sollamo, “Translation Technique,” 343–48).

55 Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 1, citing an invitation for a symposium on translation at Helsinki University in 2005.

56 For a survey of useful and not-useful methods in translation studies, see *ibid.*, 1–23. For the various categories of transformations, see *ibid.*, 57–92.

as *Vorlage* or translation technique before ascribing a high-level exegesis.⁵⁷ Perhaps because of his theoretical preferences for the process of translation and the absence of any information about the translator, he does take a different starting point than other studies of the Septuagint. He first analyzes it as an independent text before comparing it with the Masoretic Text and highlighting exegetical elements. This facilitates understanding the Greek from the target language perspective rather than falling into the habit of reading the Greek as a confirmation of the Hebrew.⁵⁸ Then, after categorizing transformations based on a comparison with the Masoretic Text, he evaluates text-critical findings, and only last does he study exegetical and ideological elements in the translation.⁵⁹

These studies of the Septuagint are relevant to an analysis of exegetical renderings in the Vulgate. As in the case of the Septuagint, identifying a rendition as exegetical requires the consideration of the *Vorlage* and Jerome's method for engaging with the source text, since these could both be possible sources for an exegetical rendering. In addition, not only does translation studies emphasize the importance of the translator's context, but the notion of translation universals also encourages caution in attributing exegetical intent to the translator rather than to the natural necessities characteristic of any translation.

Work on translation technique and the Septuagint becomes most valuable however, when it highlights the striking differences in the case of the Vulgate. The translators of the Septuagint are anonymous, so we have only the translations themselves as a basis for determining the date, provenance, background, character, and technique of the translation and the translator. This makes conclusions about Septuagint translation technique somewhat speculative. This is not the case for Jerome and the *iuxta Hebraeos*. We know a great deal about his education, historical context, theological interests, Classical influences, Jewish informants, and familiarity with exegetical traditions. Also, unlike the Septuagint, Jerome had many *Vorlagen*: the Hebrew itself, the Septuagint, the Old Latin, and the *recentiores*. And, finally, he provides programmatic statements about translation technique in his prologues to the *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, the Vulgate, and *Ep. 57*. The following observation by Staffan Olofsson, a leading scholar in LXX translation technique further highlights the differences:

The main factor behind the adoption of a literal translation technique in the LXX Pentateuch was presumably the convenience of this approach since the translators had no instruments that could facilitate the, in many

57 Ibid., 367.

58 Ibid., 90.

59 Ibid., 91.

respects, more complicated free translation process: no grammars, lexica, concordances or commentaries, and probably not even any earlier translation that they could use as their model. At the most they or at least the later translators may have employed some sort of a primitive glossary that would make the consistent rendering of words, which is one of the most prominent aspects of the literal approach, easier.⁶⁰

Not only did Jerome have grammatical training (philology), he had the equivalent of lexica (Origen's Hexapla), his own work on Hebrew names and places, Jewish informants (rabbis), and his experience as a translator, numerous commentaries (his own and those of his predecessors), and several earlier translations (the Septuagint, Old Latin, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotian). These visible details about the translator are the basis for the hypothesis that he applied *recentiores*-rabbinic philology as his technique for translating Exodus from Hebrew into Latin.

4 The Plan of This Book

This brief discussion of recent trends in the study of LXX translation technique demonstrate that the Vulgate offers a potentially rich resource for examining translation technique in general and exegetical renditions in particular. In the following chapters, I explain why it is useful to focus on interpretive elements and how to identify them in Vg Exodus. While this entails concentrating on individual aspects of Jerome's translation technique—philology, use of the Septuagint, versions, and rabbinic traditions—it must be borne in mind that they operate interdependently as a unified system. Chapter 1 develops in greater detail the rationale for concentrating on exegetical renditions in Vg Exodus based on his *recentiores*-rabbinic philology. Here I survey our extensive knowledge about Jerome's background relevant to the study of his translation technique and situate this book in Hieronymian studies. Previous works on Jerome's biblical translation do not adequately theorize exegetical elements. What constitutes an interpretive element? What makes an element significant? How can we account for the interpretive element? The starting point for such an analysis is a consideration of Jerome's translation technique, which includes close comparison with the Hebrew text to isolate variations from the Hebrew that fundamentally affect the sense of the text. This is the subject of chapters 2 and 3, where I consider examples primarily from his translation

60 Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, ConBOT 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990), 7.

of the book of Exodus that can be explained by the Hebrew alone. In chapter 2, I discuss the degree of literalness and freedom based on his programmatic statements about translation and on the text itself. In chapter 3, I argue that the philological approach can be more precisely described as mediated through categories of late antique Latin grammar. There are striking parallels between Jerome's knowledge of Latin grammar and the translational shifts in Vg Exodus. The Vulgate, however, was not the only biblical version that incorporated interpretive renderings. In chapter 4 therefore, I examine renderings dependent on the Septuagint and versions. Typically, studies on the Vulgate tend to focus on one possible explanation for the difference between the Hebrew and Latin. In addition to reading (or misreading) the Hebrew or Latinizing the Hebrew, following the Septuagint and versions, Jerome may be drawing on Jewish and Christian interpretive traditions. No one, to my knowledge, has attempted to integrate these possible explanations comprehensively. Taking a conservative approach, I assume that his interpretive rendition most likely emerges from his direct encounter with the Hebrew. This illustrates that the interpretive process not only involves copying a Greek tradition, but may also include the critical evaluation and application of these versions. If an expansive rendition cannot be explained by way of the Hebrew or versions, then it may belong to a tradition of exegesis on the relevant verse. This is the subject of chapter 5. In chapter 6, I explore the immediate reception of the Vulgate by considering how it might be understood by a Late Antique Latin audience. Rather than consider the Vulgate as a product of the interaction between exegetical traditions, here I consider the exegetical implications of the Vulgate as a work of late antique Latin literature. This revisits the philological aspect of Jerome's translation technique—philological in the Classical sense, where grammar also includes literary analysis. Instead of reading the Vulgate as product of Latin grammar, I consider how a Latin grammarian or someone educated in this tradition may have read the Vulgate. The conclusion situates the specific elements of the Vulgate translation of Exodus within a broader historical context. The flourishing fields of late antiquity, patristics, Jewish studies, and history of biblical interpretation relate to a close reading of Vg Exodus with a focus on exegetical traditions. Here we appreciate the late antique translator at work, engaging with the Hebrew, examining his Greek sources, resolving or responding to an interpretive crux. Such an approach not only provides a more secure database of exegetical renderings, it also provides a more accurate description of this "translation event."⁶¹

61 Toury, "Handful," 13.

Recentiores-Rabbinic Philology and Vg Exodus

Unlike in the case of the Septuagint, where our knowledge about the translators is speculative, we know a great deal about Jerome that sheds light on his translation technique. His biography as well as his biblical scholarship strongly suggest that Vg Exodus reflects the translation technique of *recentiores*-rabbinic philology. We know from his personal statements that he had a rigorous education in Latin grammar and literature, was deeply familiar with the Septuagint and versions, knew Hebrew, and consulted rabbis, and he regularly shares his erudition in his writings on the Bible. In addition, considering Jerome's personal background both extends recent work in Hieronymian and Vulgate studies and offers new contributions to these fields.

1.1 Life and Work¹

Next to Augustine, Jerome produced the most varied corpus of literature among Christian writers.² His work includes polemical tractates, translations of Greek Fathers, lives of ascetics, biblical commentaries, and the translation of the Bible itself from the Hebrew into Latin.³ In addition, he has left 123 letters, which include both personal details as well as a representative sample of

-
- 1 For a more detailed account of Jerome's life and work than I can provide here, see the several biographies which have been written. The most important in English are J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome, His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975) and Stefan Rebenich, *Jerome*, ECF (London: Routledge, 2002) 3–59. See also Stefan Rebenich, *Hieronymus und Sein Kreis: Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1992). The older and most thorough biographies of G. Grützmaker, *Hieronymus: Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1901–8) and Ferdinand Cavallera, *St. Jérôme: sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1922) can still be useful. For bibliographies on Jerome, see P. Antin, *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum* (CCSL 72; Turnholt: Brepols, 1959), ix–lii, which has been updated by Jean Gribomont, “The Translations. Jerome and Rufinus,” *Patrology*, ed. A. Di Berardino, trans. P. Solari (1978), 4.212–46; P. Nautin, “Hieronymus,” *TRE* 15.1–2: 304–15; H. Hagendahl and J. H. Waszink, “Hieronymus,” *RAC* 15: 117–39; and Rebenich, *Jerome*.
 - 2 Hagendahl and Waszink, “Hieronymus,” 117.
 - 3 For a catalogue of Jerome's works see Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 135 (until 392 CE; TLL Index); Grützmaker, *Hieronymus*, 1–40; and Cavallera, *St. Jérôme*, 2:153–65.

the genres that he mastered.⁴ Thus, although Jerome lacked an ancient biographer like Ambrose for Augustine, his own writings enable us to fashion a reasonably accurate picture of his life.⁵

Jerome was born to Christian parents in Stridon located somewhere on the border between Dalmatia and Pannonia in 347.⁶ Since his family was wealthy, he was educated at Rome from around 360–66.⁷ Besides receiving the traditional Classical education in grammar, rhetoric, speech, and dialectic,⁸ he also had two famous teachers: Aelius Donatus, known for his *Ars Grammatica* and commentaries on Terence and Vergil, and Marius Victorinus, a Neoplatonic rhetorician who converted to Christianity prior to becoming Jerome's teacher and produced translations of Greek philosophers and commentaries on Aristotle and Cicero.⁹ The significance of this early education cannot be underestimated because the vestiges of his classical training that color his writings regularly appear, especially in references to Vergil and Cicero.¹⁰ For these were

4 Andrew Cain, *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

5 Hagendahl and Waszink, "Hieronymus," 118.

6 *Stridon, quod a Gothis evolsum Dalmatiae quondam Pannoniaeque confinium fuit* (Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 135). There is disagreement over the exact year of his birth. P. Jay, "Sur la date de Naissance de Saint Jérôme," *RevÉLat* 51 (1973): 262–80 and A. D. Booth, "The Date of Jerome's Birth," *Phoenix* 33 (1979): 346–52 support the dating of 347 in Cavallera, *St. Jérôme*, 2:3–12) dating of 347 against P. Hamblenne, "La Longéevité de Jérôme: Prosper avait-il raison?," *Latomus* 28 (1969) 1081–1119 and Kelly, *Jerome*, 337–39, who prefer the earlier date of 331. Kelly and Hamblenne rely on Prosper of Aquitaine's *Chronica*, according to which Jerome was born in 331 and died at the age of ninety-one (*moritur anno aetatis suae xci*) in 420. Jay and Booth note his statement in his commentary on Habbukuk (3:14) that the Emperor Julian died *dum adhuc essem puer et in grammaticae ludo*. If he were born in 330, this would make him a thirty-two-year-old schoolboy. Rebenich, *Jerome*, 4 and 163 n. 3 concurs with Jay and Booth.

7 Nautin, "Hieronymus," 304; Hagendahl and Waszink, "Hieronymus," 118; Rebenich, *Jerome*, 4.

8 E.g., *In Latino paene ab ipsis incunabulis inter grammaticos et rhetores et philosophos detriti sumus* (Jerome, *Prol. Job*).

9 Hagendahl and Waszink, "Hieronymus," 318–19 and Louis Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IV^e–IX^e siècle et édition critique)* (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1981). See also Rebenich, *Jerome*, 5–6.

10 E. Lübeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1872) and H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958) are the basic works tracing the references to Classical, particularly Latin, authors.

the staple authors of a grammatical and rhetorical education. He was baptized at around age twenty.¹¹

As I consider Jerome's career, I will focus on those elements that relate to his translation of the Bible. Although it is unclear why he went to Trier in the latter part of the 360s, he probably sought imperial office.¹² In 369, perhaps influenced by Egyptian monasticism prevalent around Trier, he settled in Aquileia, where he associated with a group of ascetics including his schoolboy acquaintance Rufinus.¹³ Not only did this interest in monasticism spawn biographies of ascetics,¹⁴ it was also in the desert of Chalcis east of Antioch that our budding scholar began to learn Hebrew.¹⁵ For, around 372, forced to leave Aquileia, he initiated a journey east toward Jerusalem but delayed for two years in Antioch of Syria with his friend Evagrius.¹⁶ In 375 he endured a kind of hermit's life in the desert for a year or two.¹⁷ Moreover, although he had probably learned the rudiments of Greek in his early education, he did not become fully exposed to Greek, and patristic Greek literature in particular, until his sojourn in Antioch.¹⁸ It was there or in the desert of Chalcis where Jerome had his famous dream as a result of which he swore to avoid Classical literature.¹⁹ In 381, while attending

11 Rebenich, *Jerome*, 4.

12 Rebenich, *Jerome*, 6. See also Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, 32–41 and J. Steinhausen, "Hieronymus und Laktanz in Trier," *TZ* 20 (1951): 126–54.

13 Rebenich, *Jerome*, 7–10.

14 The most recent critical editions are Pierre Leclerc, Edgardo M. Morales, and Adalbert de Vogüé, eds., *Jérôme: Trois vies de Moines (Paul, Malchus, Hilarion)*, SC 508 (Paris: Cerf, 2007) and now Christa Gray, *Jerome, Vita Malchi: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

15 Rebenich, *Jerome*, 15.

16 Kelly, *Jerome*, 33–36.

17 J. H. D. Scourfield, "Jerome, Antioch, and the Desert: A Note on Chronology," *JTS* 37 (1986): 117–21. Contrary to the traditional view of Jerome as an extreme ascetic eremite, Rebenich, *Jerome*, 12–17 convincingly argues that he did not experience complete isolation in the desert.

18 Pierre Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers and Their Greek Sources*, trans. Harry E. Wedeck (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1969), 48–49.

19 *Ciceronianus es, non Christianus; 'ubi thesaurus tuus, ibi et cor tuum'* (Matt 6:21)... *Domine, si umquam habuero codices saeculares, si legero, te negavi* (Jerome, *Epist.* 22.30). Hagedahl, *Latin Fathers*, 322–25 and others have demonstrated that he kept this promise only temporarily. Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, 40–41 dates the dream to 370 in Trier, but Neil Adkin, *Jerome on Virginité: A Commentary on the Libellus De Virginitate Servanda* (*Letter* 22) (Cambridge: Francis Cairns, 2003), 283–86 considers the letter undatable, although he favors the more common view of setting the dream in Antioch or Chalcis in the mid 370s. According to Adkin, Jerome's dream constituted not so much a rejection of Classical

the church council on Arianism and Apollinarianism, he made his first translation (of Eusebius' *Chronicon*) and studied with Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus, the latter of whom introduced him to Origen.²⁰ He also composed a minor exegetical work on Isa 6:1–9, so by 382 he had initiated the core features of his literary corpus—asceticism, history, and biblical exegesis—all of which appear prominently in his biblical translations.²¹ After Gregory of Nazianzus was expelled from Constantinople, Jerome returned to Rome for three years. In this period, he encountered two significant personal influences on his career as a biblical translator. First, he became the secretary of Pope Damasus, who commissioned a revision of the New Testament and perhaps the whole Latin Bible.²² Second, he became friends with a circle of aristocratic Roman women that included Paula, Blessilla, Eustochium, and Marcella.²³ Marcella especially stimulated his biblical studies with her questions about the Hebrew basis of Scripture while Paula's wealth enabled him to build a monastery in Bethlehem after he was forced to leave Rome.²⁴ The monastic life

literature but rather devotion to biblical studies, so the dream offered a catalyst for his study of Hebrew. I would also argue for the more traditional dating to the mid 370s in Syria based on his introduction to the dream: "I had cut myself off from home, parents, sister, relations, and . . . from the dainty food . . . and when I was on my way to Jerusalem" (Jerome, *Epist.* 22.30; trans. Rebenich, *Jerome*, 8). This closely parallels his description of Paula's journey to Bethlehem in 385 (Jerome, *Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae* [*Epist.* 108] 8–13). Since he constructs Paula as a female Jerome, as Andrew Cain, *Jerome's Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 20–23 has shown, it is more likely that Jerome alludes to his own pilgrimage to the Holy Land not his time in Trier.

- 20 Hagendahl and Waszink, "Hieronymus," 122. Rebenich, *Jerome*, 17 suggests that he was introduced to Origen through the lectures of Apollinaris of Laodicea when he returned to Antioch and was ordained a priest. Rebenich, *Jerome*, 21–22 also notes that he primarily went to Constantinople to further his political and ecclesiastical ambitions, but later exaggerated his studies there in order to promote himself as the orthodox, ascetic scholar.
- 21 On his development into a "professional" Christian writer, see Rebenich, *Jerome*, 25–30. Rebenich acknowledges the possibility (*Jerome*, 168 n. 49) that he composed the polemical treatise *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi* in this period and thus had written in the final major genre for which he became famous.
- 22 Hagendahl and Waszink, "Hieronymus," 123 and Rebenich, *Jerome*, 31–33.
- 23 Rebenich, *Jerome*, 33–40. Rebenich wisely notes that, contrary to his self-presentation of having an almost exclusive relationship with these women, they had a broader, more complex interaction with the various Christians in Rome (*Jerome*, 40).
- 24 Hagendahl and Waszink, "Hieronymus," 124 and Nautin, "Hieronymus," 306. On Jerome's conflict with the Roman clergy see Cain, *Letters*, 99–124. On his preference for Bethlehem over Jerusalem, see Cain, *Jerome's Epitaph*, 14–20.

not only seemed to allow more time to write, it also fostered productive stimulation from Origen's library at Caesarea.²⁵ Moreover, Jerome left behind a network of supporters who provided an impetus and an audience for his literary productivity.²⁶ Thus, after disillusionment with extreme asceticism in Antioch, ecclesiastical controversy in Constantinople, and political rise and fall in Rome (382–85), Jerome founded his own monastery in Bethlehem, where he devoted himself primarily to biblical scholarship and produced the bulk of his writings until he died around 420.²⁷ This move did not mean exchanging stormy church politics at Rome for the peaceful life of a literary ascetic in Palestine. He became embroiled in the Origenist controversy which joined criticism of his orthodoxy to questioning his integrity as a translator, authority as a biblical exegete, and the legitimacy of his project to translate the Bible.²⁸

1.2 Jerome, Jewish Learning, and Biblical Scholarship

His biblical translations and commentaries must therefore be understood in the context of criticisms leveled by his opponents.²⁹ On the one hand, he had to defend himself against the accusation of heretically rejecting the ecclesiastically sanctioned Septuagint for a new translation based on the Hebrew.³⁰ On the other hand, he was charged with inadequate understanding of the Hebrew and Jewish traditions, even though he touted his Jewish knowledge as the basis of his authority.³¹ At first in Bethlehem, his biblical translation was not problematic as he continued to revise the *Vetus Latina* (the Latin translation of the Septuagint) on the basis of the Hexaplaric Septuagint of Origen

25 Gribimont, "Translations," 216.

26 Patrons such as Marcella and Pammachius offered financial backing for his literary endeavors and connected him to ascetic communities throughout the Roman empire (Rebenich, *Jerome*, 41).

27 Hagendahl and Waszink, "Hieronymus," 126–34.

28 Rebenich, *Jerome*, 41–51. On the Origenist controversy in particular, see Elizabeth Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

29 Rebenich, *Jerome*, 52–59.

30 See Rebenich, *Jerome*, 58, citing Rufinus, *Apol. Hier.* 2.41.

31 E.g., he defends the Hebraic authority of his translation of קִיקִיּוֹן (Jonah 4:6) as *hedera* 'ivy' rather than the traditional *cucurbita* 'gourd' against the claims of North African Jewish informants cited by Augustine (Rebenich, *Jerome*, 56–57).

(385–91).³² Around 391, however, he began his translation of the Bible based on the Hebrew, *iuxta Hebraeos*, in coordination with complementary technical treatises that demonstrate his Hebrew erudition, including *De nominibus Hebraicis*, *De situ et nominibus locorum Hebraicorum*, and the *Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*.³³ Although *quaestiones* are preserved only for the book of Genesis and in scattered letters, he indicates in the preface to his *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* that he may have composed a similar work for all of scripture: "... in books of Hebrew questions, which I have planned to write on all of holy Scriptures."³⁴ Whether he actually published a similar work on Exodus cannot be proven. However, the method employed by the *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* would be relevant to his translation *iuxta Hebraeos* because either he had already begun composing *quaestiones* on Exodus or at least approached his translation from a similar vantage point.³⁵ This method, which Adam Kamesar calls "*recentiores*-rabbinic philology," claims that "the rabbinic sources were to be used in close association with the *recentiores*."³⁶ That is, Jerome utilized the Septuagint and the recensions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion in connection with rabbinic writings in order to reach an understanding of the Hebrew text. He continued to apply this method in the commentaries he wrote on the Old Testament until his death.³⁷ This method constitutes an ingenious response to his critics: he continues to acknowledge the Septuagint as authoritative (albeit not the supreme authority) while demonstrating his mastery of Hebrew and Jewish traditions.

32 See A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993) 49–58.

33 Kamesar, *Jerome*, 1–2. There are a number of possible explanations for why Jerome decided to translate directly from the Hebrew rather than revise the Old Latin, see below, p. 33.

34 "... in libris hebraicarum quaestionum, quos in omnem scripturam sanctam disposui scribere. See also *Libros enim hebraicarum quaestionum nunc in manibus habeo* ... 'for I am now working on books of Hebrew questions' (Jerome, *Nom. hebr.* prol.) and C. T. R. Hayward, *Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 92.

35 It is possible that he had begun *quaestiones* on Exodus because, unlike in the translation itself, he was producing the technical works systematically, and he refers to putting aside the *Quaestionum Hebraicarum libri* in the preface to his translation of Origen's *Homiliae in Lucam*. Nonetheless, it remains unclear whether he temporarily set aside the *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* or a next installment of *quaestiones*. See Kamesar, *Jerome*, 75.

36 Kamesar, *Jerome*, 194.

37 Louis N. Hartmann, "Jerome as an Exegete," in *A Monument to Saint Jerome*, ed. Francis Murphy (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1952), 35–81 and H. F. D. Sparks, "Jerome as Biblical Scholar," *CHB* 1 (1970): 510–41.

Engagement with Jewish traditions hardly explains the full range of Jerome's biblical scholarship. Kamesar, for example, does not deny that Jerome utilized Greek exegetical traditions or that Christian traditions played a role in his work but rather deemphasizes their significance in his coming to terms with the Hebrew.³⁸ He had both physical and literary contact with the major Greek and Latin Christian writers. He went to school with Rufinus, attacked Ambrose, corresponded with Augustine, attended lectures by Apollinaris and Didymus, associated with Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa, and travelled with Epiphanius of Salamis. Moreover, he translated works of Eusebius, Origen, and Didymus and incorporated into his works interpretations of the Antiochene exegetes Diodore of Tarsus and Eusebius of Emesa.³⁹

But neither does Christian scholarship alone account for Jerome's biblical work, as Kamesar correctly notes. As Jay Braverman astutely observes:

in the same letter [Jerome, *Epist.* 84] where he describes his education and influential teachers, together with Apollinaris and Didymus he mentions a Jewish teacher, Bar-anina, from whom he learned "with what trouble and at what a cost."⁴⁰

When Jerome learned Hebrew in the Syrian desert, he also initiated an encounter with Jewish scholars and scholarship that continued throughout his career. Since Braverman nicely presents the evidence of his contact with rabbis, here I will summarize his salient points. It is particularly significant that Jerome had a great deal of personal contact with Jewish scholars. Rather than mentioning them by name (such as Baranina), he more often refers to his Jewish teachers as *deuterotes* (תנאים), *scriba* (סופר), and *sapiens* (חכם), all technical terms for Jewish scholars in rabbinic literature.⁴¹ He conferred with these Jewish teachers in his revision of the Vetus Latina version of Chronicles as well as the Vulgate translations of Tobit and Job.⁴² Indeed, Jerome learned Hebrew from a monk who

38 Kamesar, *Jerome*, 189–91.

39 On Jerome and the Greek Church, see Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers*, 49–50; Kamesar, *Jerome*, 97–175; and Gustav Bardy, "St. Jerome and Greek Thought," in *A Monument to Saint Jerome*, ed. F. Murphy, (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1952), 83–112.

40 Jay Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1978), 3–4.

41 Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Latin Translations," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling, CRINT 2.1 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 315.

42 Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, 4.

had converted from Judaism.⁴³ The evidence from his *Commentary on Nahum* 2:1 indicates that he pursued his Hebrew studies during the thirty-five years he lived in Palestine. That these contacts with rabbis of the talmudic period played an integral role in his biblical work emerges from the almost programmatic statement found in his *Commentary on Zechariah* 6:9–15. He writes, “I once proposed to publish to Latin ears the secrets of Hebrew learning and the hidden teaching of the teachers in the synagogues, in so far as they are relevant to sacred scriptures.”⁴⁴ Thus, it is not surprising that Braverman notes: “we find hundreds of Jewish traditions preserved in his commentaries referring to all aspects of biblical interpretation.”⁴⁵ Nevertheless, this evidence for his contact with Palestinian rabbis indicates two difficult but not insurmountable challenges in analyzing the Jewish element in his works. First, although he may have seen some rabbinic texts, the bulk of his contact seems to be personal and on an ad hoc basis.⁴⁶ Therefore, I can assert only that he was influenced by a particular rabbinic interpretation of a particular passage, not that he had an entire rabbinic text before him. That is, just because a tradition may be preserved in the Mekhilta, Jerome did not necessarily read this text. Similarly, just because he reflects a tradition preserved in the Targum, he is not necessarily aware of targumic interpretations in adjacent verses. It is more likely that these traditions were mediated through his Jewish informants.⁴⁷ Second, dating rabbinic traditions can be problematic, for these traditions may appear in texts redacted long after Jerome lived.⁴⁸ In response to this issue with respect to the Targumim, I follow Geza Vermes’ rule of thumb: “unless there is specific proof to the contrary, the haggadah of the Palestinian Targums is likely to . . . antedate the outbreak of the Second Jewish Revolt in a.d. 132.”⁴⁹ In the case of rabbinic commentaries, I try to cite from either a text or a rabbi that predates Jerome.⁵⁰

43 Jerome, *Epist.* 125.12.

44 *Semel proposui arcana eruditionis Hebraicae, et magistrorum synagogae reconditam disciplinam, eam dumtaxat, quae scripturis sanctis convenit, Latinis auribus prodere.*

45 Braverman, *Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel*, 6.

46 Kedar-Kopfstein, “Latin Translations,” 315 cites *sicubi dubitas, Hebraeos interroga* (Jerome, *Epist.* 112.20).

47 Such is the conclusion of Hillel Newman “Jerome and the Jews” (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1997 [Hebrew]), 122 in his definitive study on the subject. Also, Jerome probably did not know Aramaic very well; see Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 82–85.

48 See Strack-Stemberger, 52–54, 63–66.

49 Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, ed. Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973), 1:104–105.

50 On the principle of dating traditions by the rabbi to whom they are attributed, see Strack-Stemberger, 63–66.

Throughout this period of contact with Christian and Jewish scholars, Jerome must have developed greater skill in his translation technique as he continued to published the *iuxta Hebraeos*. Most scholars agree that he produced his translation from 390–405 in the following order: Prophets, Samuel and Kings, Psalms, Job by 393; Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles in 394–96; Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs in 398; and the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth and Esther from 398–405.⁵¹ Some books he claims to have translated quickly—such as Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes,—while he labored over others, such as the Pentateuch, for years.⁵² Exodus was therefore one of the last books translated, and here we would expect the most refined application of his *recentiores*-rabbinic philology.

1.3 Recent Trends in Hieronymian Studies

Jerome's life and literary background, as well as the relatively late date in which he translated Exodus, recommend my specific and general approach for analyzing this translation. This will become clearer through a consideration of recent trends in Hieronymian scholarship.

A brief discussion of current views on Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew supports my assumption in this study that Jerome had expert knowledge of Hebrew. His Hebrew ability used to generate vigorous scholarly debate but now enjoys general acceptance, albeit with greater precision and nuance. Those who have questioned his Hebrew ability are usually influenced by Gustave Bardy and Pierre Nautin, who argued that Jerome relied on Origen and other patristic writers for his Jewish traditions.⁵³ The fact that he utilizes the Greek tradition raises the possibility that his translation is based primarily on

51 Kedar-Kopfstein, "Latin Translations," 320–21. Most scholars date Samuel and Kings before Prophets following the order described in the *Prologus Galeatus* which is attached to the translation of Samuel and Kings. Cavallera, *St. Jérôme*, 2:28–29 doubted this order and dated the Prophets and Psalms first. Pierre Jay, "La datation des premières traductions de l'Ancien Testament sur l'hébreu par saint Jérôme," *REAug* 38 (1982): 208–12, defends Cavallera's position through a critical reading of the *Prologus Galeatus* and because the prologue to the translation of Isaiah claims the introduction of a new way of ordering the text through *cola et commata*. Kedar-Kopfstein defends Cavallera's view through the chronological analysis of Jerome's developing translation technique.

52 The translation of the books of Solomon took three days (Jerome, *Prolog. Sal.*). In contrast, as he writes in *Prolog. Pent.*: "I have finally finished the Pentateuch of Moses, and feel as if I have been liberated from an immense interest charge."

53 Gustave Bardy, "Saint Jérôme et ses maîtres hébreux," *RBén* 46 (1934): 145–64; Pierre Nautin, *Origène. Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977); and Nautin, "Hieronymus." Bardy

his Greek *Vorlagen*. Any apparent competence in Hebrew could merely reflect the Hebrew knowledge of his Greek sources. On the positive side would be his own claims to Hebrew education and erudition, as well as his many references to Hebrew language and rabbinic tradition.⁵⁴ On the negative side would be mistakes in his Hebrew as well as the possibility that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion served as his sources for the Hebrew and he copied rabbinic traditions from Origen.⁵⁵ Although an extensive analysis of his Hebrew knowledge has yet to be made, the immense number of examples of correct references to Hebrew support the position that he knew the language. Moreover, mistakes in Hebrew do not prove ignorance of the language. Kamesar convincingly argues that Jerome's mistakes are too inconsequential and certain applications of Hebrew too sophisticated to betray ignorance of the language. Kamesar further notes the possibility that Jerome used separate editions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion which would explain the occasional lack of cor-

claims that Jerome *may* have relied on his Greek sources for Jewish traditions, but Nautin goes even further claiming that Jerome invented his encounters with Jewish scholars.

- 54 See C. J. Elliot, "Hebrew Learning among the Fathers," *DCB* 2:851–72 (ed. William Smith and Henry Wace, 1880). Elliot also notes that Jerome taught others Hebrew and translated with rapidity. Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 80–82, argues that Jerome had more knowledge of Hebrew compared to Philo and Origen. Stefan Rebenich, "Jerome: The 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas,'" *VC* 47 (1993), 50–77 has argued that he used Jewish exegesis in addition to Christian exegesis, he could pronounce Hebrew, and Rufinus corroborates the existence of one of Jerome's teachers, Bar Haninas. Rebenich further argues that linguistic studies have demonstrated Jerome's Hebrew knowledge. Such studies include Cyrus Gordon, "Rabbinic Exegesis in the Vulgate of Proverbs," *JBL* 49 (1930): 384–416; C. T. R. Hayward, "Saint Jerome and the Aramaic Targumim," *JSS* 32 (1987): 105–23; and Friedrich Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testament aus der hebraica veritas," *Bib* 10 (1929): 3–30. See also Hagendahl, and Waszink, "Hieronymus," 134 and Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Latin Translations," 315–19. Of course, Hillel Newman's most thorough study of the subject ("Jerome and the Jews") demonstrates that Jerome had direct knowledge of Jewish traditions and Hebrew.
- 55 Elliot, "Hebrew Learning," 864–872, also argues that Jerome's modesty towards his Hebrew erudition may actually be genuine because Jerome exaggerates his abilities in other areas. In addition, he is knowledgeable in Hebrew only relative to Christians, and he stretches some etymologies, interchanges gutturals, and primarily comments on semantics. Nautin, "Hieronymus," 309–10 and Roger Gryson, introduction to *Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe*, ed. R. Gryson and P.-A. Deproost (Freiburg: Herder, 1993) contend that Jerome based the *iuxta Hebraeos* on a Hexaplaric manuscript of the Septuagint with marginal readings from the *recentiores* and Jerome's correct Hebrew references derive from Origen and other Greek fathers while his mistakes arise when he strikes out on his own.

respondence between Jerome's citation from the versions and the original Hebrew. For if he had used the Hexapla, the word-by-word layout would have prevented any such mistakes. Moreover, it is also possible that he had a separate edition of the Hebrew rather than the first two columns of the Hexapla.⁵⁶ In fact, the high level of Jerome's errors actually confirms his erudition.⁵⁷ David Paul McCarthy asserts that a close textual analysis of Jerome's *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* reveals little knowledge of Hebrew.⁵⁸ However, one must be careful when extrapolating from such data to the rest of the *iuxta Hebraeos* because, as McCarthy himself notes, Jerome translated the Psalms first. In addition, the liturgical prominence of the Psalms would have applied extra pressure on him to preserve traditional readings wherever possible. My own contention in this book that he understands the Hebrew grammatically and utilizes his Greek sources critically (see chapter 4) further demonstrates a profound knowledge of Hebrew. Finally, since he employed Origen's Hexapla so extensively and over a considerable length of time, the columnar structure of the work would have taught him Hebrew.⁵⁹ That Jerome exploited the rhetorical possibilities of his Hebrew knowledge is a separate question from the actual extent of this knowledge.⁶⁰

56 Adam Kamesar, review of Gryson, *Commentaires de Jérôme*, *JTS* 45 [1994] 730–31.

57 For Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Vulgate as a Translation" (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1968), 52–53, Jerome's confusion of *alef* and *ayin* actually prove that he independently evaluated a Hebrew *Vorlage* because such a mistake presupposes a knowledge of Hebrew. More recently, Hillel Newman, "How Should We Measure Jerome's Hebrew Competence?," in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings, and Legacy*, ed. Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl (Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009), 131–40 has argued that Jerome had an extensive knowledge of the Hebrew language which did not prevent him from making mistakes and deriving Hebrew erudition from Greek as well as Jewish sources.

58 David Paul McCarthy, "Some Useful Things Worth Knowing about the Vulgate and Jerome," *SBLSP* (1994): 323.

59 See below, chapter 4. Jerome spent around fifteen years translating the Bible (Nautin, "Hieronymus," 309 and Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Latin Translations," 320). As for the pedagogical possibilities of the Hexapla, Harry Orlinsky, "The Columnar Order of the Hexapla," in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations*, ed. Sidney Jellicoe (Library of Biblical Studies; New York: Ktav, 1974) 369–81 even suggests Origen intended the work to be a "textbook wherewith to learn the Hebrew language" (381).

60 Megan Hale Williams, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006) and "Lessons from Jerome's Jewish Teachers: Exegesis and Cultural Interaction in Late Antique Palestine," in *Jewish Biblical Interpretation and Cultural Exchange: Comparative Exegesis in Context*, ed. Natalie B. Dohrmann and David Stern (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 85.

While scholars continue to examine specific questions such as how well he knew Greek, Latin, and Hebrew; the quality, character, and Christianness of his translation; or his position in the Church, a newer direction in recent work on Jerome explores and explains him as a product of late antique Latin culture. Thus, some monographs situate his biblical scholarship in the late antique grammatical tradition,⁶¹ others appreciate his Classical literary technique,⁶² some present him as a product of his social relationships,⁶³ while one scholar suggests that his works on Latin ascetics reflect Classical and rabbinic models.⁶⁴ Instead of mining his writings for techniques of biblical scholarship and asceticism, Megan Williams argues that he integrates monasticism and exegesis in a process of self-fashioning.⁶⁵ Similarly, Andrew Cain investigates Jerome's letters as discourse that constructs identity rather than as a treasure trove of biographical detail.⁶⁶ Mention also should be made of Hillel Newman's doctoral thesis on Jerome and the Jews.⁶⁷ Newman eschews theoretical models that have become fashionable in late antique studies and collects, analyzes, and codifies the vast number of references to Jews and Judaica; as such it constitutes an outstanding resource for understanding the cultural, social, and religious history of late antique Judaism. Newman's work points to the continued value of traditional studies, a point not ignored by Williams. In her theoretically sophisticated book, she also explores the expensive material aspects of book production which complicate the integration of asceticism and biblical scholarship.⁶⁸

-
- 61 Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993) describes his methodology in the *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* as a "recentiores-rabbinic" philology combining Jewish, Christian, and Classical traditions. Michael Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on his Commentary on Jeremiah* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) reveals Jerome as the true student of Aelius Donatus through his grammatical approach to Hebrew in his commentary on Jeremiah. See also Alfons Fürst, *Hieronymus: Askese und Wissenschaft in der Spätantike* (Freiburg: Herder, 2003).
- 62 E.g., J. H. D. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) and the numerous articles of Neil Adkin as well as his *Jerome on Virginity*.
- 63 Clark, *Origenist Controversy* and Rebenich, *Hieronymus*.
- 64 Susan Weingarten, *The Saint's Saints: Hagiography and Geography in Jerome* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- 65 Williams, *Monk and the Book*.
- 66 Cain, *Letters*.
- 67 Newman, "Jerome and the Jews."
- 68 Williams, *Monk and the Book*, 167–200. She astutely notes that the contradiction between monastic *askesis* and Jerome's dependence on elite patronage could serve as a productive tension (233).

Williams' interest in the material dimensions of book production, as well as strategies of self-presentation, reflects this general rapprochement in the field of late antiquity between positivist, objective history and discursive analysis.⁶⁹ This balanced approach is well demonstrated in the recent collection of essays, *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings, and Legacy* edited by Cain and Josef Lössl.⁷⁰ The collection is based on a conference *Jerome of Stridon: Religion, Culture, Society and Literature in Late Antiquity* that took place at Cardiff University in Wales in the summer of 2006. In a report on the conference, Alfons Füst nicely summarized the current state of Hieronymian scholarship: current researchers and literature note that his writings serve not only objective goals but also the self-fashioning and discursive constructions of the author.⁷¹ For example, Philip Rousseau, through a close textual reading, demonstrates how the commentary on the book of Jeremiah responds to the sack of Rome.⁷²

The essays dealing with Jerome's translations are particularly illuminating because they unite textual and discursive readings albeit with mixed results. Explaining that his Latin rendition of Tob 4:10–11 and 12:8–9 introduces a

69 While Williams rejects traditional approaches based on the teleological idea of historical progress and apologetic defenses or attacks on his competency, she also criticizes the emphasis on the social context of learning in antiquity without attention to the "material conditions under which it operated" (Williams, *Monk and the Book*, 19, 22).

70 Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl, eds., *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings, and Legacy* (Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009).

71 Alfons Füst, "Aktuelle Tendenzen der Hieronymus-Forschung: Impressionen von einer Tagung über Hieronymus in Cardiff," *Adamantius* 13 (2007): 144–51. Füst is paraphrasing J. H. D. Scourfield's opening lecture "Exemplarity and Self-Fashioning Jerome's Letters of Consolation." The papers published from the conference are divided into three parts: "Hagiography, Letters, Heresy, and the Man"; "The Science of Scripture: Philology, Exegesis, and Translation"; and "Reception: Fifth through Sixteenth Century."

72 Philip Rousseau, "Jerome on Jeremiah: Exegesis and Recovery," 73–86. Rousseau integrates objective and discursive analysis. More often, however, the collection juxtaposes rhetorical studies with more positivist approaches. Thus, Stefan Rebenich, "Inventing an Ascetic Hero: Jerome's 'Life of Paul the First Hermit,'" 13–29 reads "The Life of Paul" as generating a Western asceticism based on the *monachus eruditus* in contrast to Eastern *Volksfrömmigkeit* (23), while Neil Adkin, "Tertullian in Jerome's Consolation to Heliodorus [Ep. 60]," 41–45 identifies Tertullian as the source of an unusual rhetorical flourish in Jerome, *Epist.* 60. In addition to Rebenich's piece, essays explaining Jerome's discursive strategies include Andrew Cain, "Rethinking Jerome's Portraits of Holy Women," 47–58; Alfons Füst, "Jerome Keeping Silent: Origen and his Exegesis of Isaiah," 141–52; and Giacomina Raspanti, "The Significance of Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians* in his Exegetical Production," 163–74. On the objective side, we find Newman, "How Should We Measure," 131–40 and Régis Courtray, "La Figure des Deux Larrons chez Jérôme," 105–16.

connection between almsgiving and eternal life, Danuta Shanzer highlights the impact of translation when viewed in its social and literary contexts.⁷³ Especially germane to my study is the chapter by John Cameron, “The Rabbinic Vulgate?”⁷⁴ Based on his analysis of the translation of the Psalter, Cameron attempts to disprove Dominique Barthélemy’s claim that “Jerome sought by means of his Biblical translations to replace the Old Testament of the Church with the Bible of the rabbis.”⁷⁵ I find Cameron’s argument problematic not because the Vulgate is a rabbinic Bible, but because Cameron collapses the distinction between his own representation of his work as a translation *iuxta Hebraeos* (according to the Hebrews) and a rabbinic Targum. Cameron’s argument rests on two principles: a distinction between exegesis and philology, on the one hand, and the paucity of renditions that reflect rabbinic exegesis, on the other.⁷⁶ He further questions the relevance of the notion popular in translation theory that all translations are necessarily exegetical. This does not apply to Jerome because he would not have recognized such a theoretical model. In essence, Cameron utilizes an objective analysis of a Hieronymian text to reject a discursive strategy of a twentieth-century French scholar. Barthélemy wrote during a time when Jerome’s Jewish influences were undetermined, particularly as a result of Bardy’s famous article attributing some of these Jewish traditions to his Greek sources.⁷⁷ So it is not surprising that Jerome does not apply a targumic translation technique since he himself never describes his work as a “rabbinic translation.” Put differently, the terminology used by Jerome—*iuxta Hebraicam veritatem* and *iuxta Hebraeos* does not mean ‘targum’ or ‘rabbinic/Jewish translation’, but is rather a translation for Christians deriving its philological accuracy from Hebrew tradition. In this

73 Danuta Shanzer, “Jerome, Tobit, Alms, and the Vita Aeterna,” 87–104. According to Shanzer, these verses from Tobit suborned efforts of churchmen to divert funds from heirs to themselves. In addition, since *subintroductio* (spiritual marriage) and Jerome’s own advocacy of virginity—by diverting funds from the heirs to the Church—approached *captatio* (legacy hunting), a favorite target of satirical invective, the translation may have mitigated a tension emerging from one of Jerome’s common literary influences from Classical literature.

74 John Cameron, “The Rabbinic Vulgate?,” 117–30.

75 Cameron, “Rabbinic Vulgate,” 117.

76 Cameron, “Rabbinic Vulgate,” 118–19.

77 Bardy, “Saint Jérôme et ses maîtres.” Pierre Nautin (*Origène* and “Hieronymus”), much less cautiously than Bardy, argued that he invented his interactions with contemporary Jewish scholars, a point which has been thoroughly discredited in recent decades; see above, pp. 23–25.

sense, Cameron actually agrees with Kamesar who coins the term “*recentiores*-rabbinic philology.” Just as Cameron avoids “targum” to describe the Vulgate, Kamesar does not label the *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* as “midrash.” I also disagree with the claim⁷⁸ that his reliance on Jewish traditions is not remarkable compared to Cameron’s constructed notion of a rabbinic Vulgate. First, the so-called rabbinic translations are simply interesting in different ways (as in the case of Targum Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi); second, his prefaces, letters, and commentary abundantly demonstrate that his rendition and methods were considered quite remarkable by his contemporaries.⁷⁹ As I show in this book, his Hebrew sources include rabbinic traditions, but also the Hebrew language, and the Septuagint and versions. Moreover, rabbinic translations range from literal to paraphrastic so, while Cameron rightly distinguishes the Vulgate from something like the exegetically expansive Targum Yerushalmi or Targum Neofiti, the more literal Targum Onkelos, peppered with brief exegetical moments, does offer a parallel to his work.⁸⁰ Cameron’s claim that Jerome’s translation method is “scientific,” not “Jewish,” is also problematic.⁸¹ He contends that since the Vulgate does not clearly reflect a rabbinic interpretation of the Hebrew text and is intended for a Christian audience, it cannot be classified as Jewish.⁸² Even the fact that the term *Hebraei* can refer to both the Hebrew text and Jewish exegetes fails to convince Cameron that the

78 Cameron, “Rabbinic Vulgate,” 120.

79 For a more nuanced position, see Alison Salvesen, “A Convergence of the Ways? The Judaizing of Christian Scripture by Origen and Jerome,” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed; Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 233–58, who prefers the term “convergence” to describe the close connection between the Christian Bible and Jewish Bible rather than appropriation of a Jewish Targum.

80 In his very formulation of the question, Cameron does not define “rabbinic translation,” if such a phenomenon can even be defined; see, most recently, Willem Smelik, *Rabbis, Language, and Translation in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), esp. 139–70 and 220–70. On the typology of Targumim see P. S. Alexander, “Jewish Aramaic Translations,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988) 217–53. In fact, although the exegetical tangents are much longer in Targum Yerushalmi and Neophyti than in Onkelos, they are still scattered between fairly literal translations of the Hebrew text. The Vulgate is similar to a rabbinic translation in the sense of a translation with dispersed exegetical moments. Even if we acknowledge Cameron’s claim that the Vulgate relies primarily on the Hebrew rather than rabbinic exegesis, how is this different from Targum Onkelos?

81 Cameron, “Rabbinic Vulgate,” 120.

82 Cameron, “Rabbinic Vulgate,” 121.

Vulgate is the source (*fons*) of rabbinic truth.⁸³ Contrary to Kamesar's demonstration that in both cases *Hebraei* represent sources to which one has recourse for answers,⁸⁴ Cameron simply asserts that Jerome's use of the same term for rabbis and the Hebrew text does not mean that *iuxta Hebraeos*, Jerome's term for his translation, can also be understood as "according to the rabbis." In fact, his method is philological, but in the Classical grammatical sense. Resorting to the Hebrew language and Jewish traditions to resolve translational cruxes reflects the Classical grammatical tradition. This tradition, however, does not distinguish between philology and exegesis, as Cameron himself recognizes.⁸⁵ Rather, exegesis is a subcategory of philology. Therefore, a "scientific" approach would involve both close attention to language and consideration of various exegeses. And here is where I do not understand the difference between a rabbinic translation and a translation based on the Hebrew text and Jewish exegetical traditions. What Cameron has done is merely to demonstrate the obvious, that the form of translation is different than the form of commentary. But this does not prove that a translation lacks exegesis. Finally, Cameron uses a sample limited to the Latin Psalter. So the two examples of rabbinic exegesis that Cameron cites⁸⁶ show only that Jerome rarely employs rabbinic traditions in his translation of the Psalms. Much different is the case of Vg Genesis, where we have direct evidence of his Jewish sources in his *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* and we find that the two sources agree ninety-nine times.⁸⁷ Cameron does usefully distinguish between exegesis and philology in Jerome's own terminology, even if he does not seem to grasp the full nature of the distinction.⁸⁸ In the case of exegesis, Jerome applies what has been termed an "exegetical

83 Cameron, "Rabbinic Vulgate," 124–25.

84 Kamesar, *Jerome*, 45.

85 Cameron, "Rabbinic Vulgate," 120.

86 Cameron, "Rabbinic Vulgate," 125–29.

87 At least according to Hayward, *Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions*, 11. Hayward also notes that the Vulgate and *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* disagree approximately eighty times including twenty-four occasions where the Vulgate follows the Septuagint, even when Jerome shares concerns about the Septuagint in *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*.

88 The distinction is not completely correct. One category of philology is *historia*, which includes the interpretation of historical, geographical, scientific, and mythological details. A technical term common among late antique scholars, Jerome's understanding of *historia* represents a combination of the Classical grammatical tradition and patristic exegesis. According to Classical grammarians, *historia* can refer to a type of content or an exegetical technique. As content, *historia* refers to actual facts or, at least, the verisimilitude of reality. As an exegetical technique, *historia* indicates the use of realia to explicate a literary text. See David Dietz, "Historia in the Commentary of Servius," *TAPA* 125

maximalism.”⁸⁹ That is, in his exegetical works, he will often faithfully report various opinions sometimes including his own or allow the reader to decide.⁹⁰ The translator, of course, cannot provide optional translations but must produce one text.⁹¹

The paucity of rabbinic traditions in the Vg Psalms might give us pause, since I will be identifying a number of exegetical renditions in Exodus that relate to Jewish sources. Nevertheless, this simply shows that he approached his translation of Psalms differently than that of the Pentateuch.⁹² We would expect this difference if we were to compare the so-called new work of *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* filled with midrashic parallels with *Epistle* 106, his lengthy letter on the translation of particular verses of Psalms, which never refers to rabbinic traditions.⁹³ So the essay by Aline Canellis on the commentary on Zechariah may be more relevant here.⁹⁴ Although technically a commentary, *In Zachariam* seems like a translation of Didymus’ commentary. Canellis,

(1995): 61–97; Adam Kamesar, “The Evaluation of the Narrative Aggada in Greek and Latin Patristic Literature,” *JTS* 45 (1994): 37–71; and below pp. 83–84, 157–167.

89 Kamesar, *Jerome*, 19, 27–28.

90 Thus, Cameron fails to acknowledge how Jerome’s Classical heritage mediates his approach to philology and exegesis.

91 Origen did not produce the Hexapla as a kind of smorgasbord translation for the reader to decide from various options, although that did not prevent Jerome from using it in this way. And yet Cameron seems to associate multiple translations with rabbinic translation when he states that Jerome “offered these alternative exegeses on the basis of the same Latin text, that is he divined different exegeses within the same translation, rather than offering different ‘translations-exegeses’ to begin with. It seems that he would not have recognized his translations as being in themselves exegetical” (Cameron, “Rabbinic Vulgate,” 119). Ironically, the three preserved Latin versions of the Psalter offer just such an alternative.

92 Jerome’s prefaces to his biblical translations demonstrate that he varied his approach to different books, while Williams (*Monk and the Book*, 63–95) shows that his technique developed over time. Williams (*Monk and the Book*, 85, n. 56–57) exposes the problematic assessment of his method by Colette Estin, whose study is based on the three translations of the Psalter. Estin, according to Williams, argues that Jerome relied primarily on the *recentiores* and not on the Hebrew.

93 In his catalogue of aggadic references Hillel Newman, “Jerome and the Jews,” 207–19 lists twenty-eight instances from *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* but only two from his *Commentarioli in Psalmos*, one from his *Tractatus in Psalmum 10*, and seven from *Tractatus in Psalmum 95*.

94 Aline Canellis, “L’*In Zachariam* de Jérôme et la Tradition Alexandrine,” in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*, ed. Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl (Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009), 153–62.

however, questions Louis Doutreleau's claim that Jerome merely copies Didymus.⁹⁵ A close comparison of the commentaries reveals a Hieronymian personality. He more than renders Didymus into Latin—he rearranges citations and shortens, lengthens, regroups, disassociates, alludes to or cites, adapts, and adjusts words and ideas through subtracting; changing the phrase, the structure, the tense, the mood, the person, and sometimes even the sense; not to mention vacillating between Hebrew and Septuagint. He uses *variatio* and romanizes the work with verbal nods to classical sources such as Cicero.⁹⁶ *Mutatis mutandis*, the same thing could be said about Jerome's translation of the book of Exodus.

The collection of Cain and Lössl indicates how the categories of constructed meaning and objective analysis complement each other, deepening our understanding of Jerome. Consider, for example, how Williams accounts for the apparent contradiction between his negative assessment of Jews and Judaism and his positive use of Jewish erudition.⁹⁷ According to her, he constructs and rejects Jewish learning and Jews as carnal in the process of fashioning himself as an ascetic.⁹⁸ In the course of her discussion, she makes an important methodological distinction between examining how he explains his interactions with Jews and Jewish learning (the subject of her analysis) and the investigation of the actual parallels, which are interesting to pursue in their own right.⁹⁹ That is, explaining his apologetic descriptions, methodological discussions, and discursive uses of his translation *iuxta Hebraeos* to establish his identity, authority, and/or legitimacy simply represents a line of approach different from analyzing the translation itself. And yet, Williams' conclusion—"Jerome's deployment of Jewish learning, then, and his descriptions of its exponents, construct not a bridge but a wall between 'the classic Jewish culture' and Latin Christendom"¹⁰⁰—could also be said of a translation: the process of translation requires transgression of boundaries, but the end product functions as a wall between these boundaries.¹⁰¹

95 Ibid., 153.

96 Ibid., 155, 158–59, 161.

97 Williams, "Lessons," 66–86.

98 E.g., in addition to erudition, his Jewish informants displayed a carnal venality because they received payment for their scholarship (Ibid., 82).

99 Ibid., 85.

100 Ibid., 84.

101 This is stage two or the act of aggression according to George Steiner's ethical classification of the translation process in "The Hermeneutic Motion," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 186–97. How is translation an act of aggression? Heidegger argues that understanding, being appropriative, is inherently

1.4 Approaches to the Vulgate

These recent trends in Hieronymian studies apply specifically to the Vulgate. Just as a rhetorical reading of Jerome's writings about the Bible expose the construction of his identity negotiated in a late antique milieu, so too does a close reading of his translation of the Bible reveal the construction of a text negotiated within the constraints and opportunities of the late antique world. This is a far cry from the original approaches to the Vulgate perhaps best summarized by Georg Grützmacher.¹⁰² Typically, he categorizes the reasons for translating directly from the Hebrew,¹⁰³ defines the character of the translation,¹⁰⁴ assesses

violent ("We translate into") just as Jerome uses the language of captivity, or we "break" a code Steiner, "Hermeneutic Motion," 187). The aggression can happen both ways because when the target language incorporates the source text, the appropriation affects the appropriators and their system of meaning. Steiner believes that ultimately this aggression can be transcended through reciprocity, exchange between the source text and target language without loss (Steiner, "Hermeneutic Motion," 189–90). Similarly, Williams observes that Jerome's disrespectful representation of Jews should not obscure Origen's more reciprocal attitude. Williams, "Lessons," 68–69 rightly notes that the problem of his relationship with his Jewish interlocutors is symptomatic of a larger issue concerning how Jews and Christians in late antiquity interacted. Citing Peter Schäfer, who sees the interaction as active appropriation, Williams, "Lessons," 68 explains, "the recipient actively digests the transmitted tradition, transforms it, and creates something new." Although the boundaries between Judaism and Christianity are not considered closed, Schäfer goes so far as to compare the process of re-creating to "killing" the transmitted (Williams, "Lessons," 69). For a similar approach to the Jewish-Christian encounter in antiquity, see Andrew S. Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004).

102 Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, esp. 91–110.

103 Reasons for initiating the *iuxta Hebraeos* include: the revision according to the Septuagint became too problematic (Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, 96), too many variants in the Latin codices (103), the Apostles followed the Hebrew, mysteries of Church would be revealed (104–5), and it would be useful in disputes with Jews (105–6). Rather than attacking the Septuagint, Jerome's version should be viewed as new work, valuable as a translation produced by a Christian after the "arrival of Christ" (Jerome, *Prol. Pent.* See further, Kamesar, *Jerome*, 64–69). Grützmacher simply summarizes Jerome's own writings on the subject. See also Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 97–103. While there is no reason to doubt his expressed rationales for the translation, the more recent emphasis on the discursive functions extends our understanding of these rationales.

104 Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, 107. Although at the time a difficult task because of the absence of critical editions, nevertheless even then Grützmacher described the work as scientific.

his qualifications,¹⁰⁵ and attempts to define the principles of his method.¹⁰⁶ On this last point, his words reveal a surprisingly modern astuteness:

It appears to me, however, not unimportant, even if one rightly accuses Jerome of a certain lack of principles in his translation, to raise the question, how far one could and should establish strict principles for such a translation work. . . . [His translation is] an implementation of ideational content and a conceptual world of a cultural spirit separate by a long period of time into a very different idiom. This requires almost more tact than principles, more inspired acumen, than grammatical schooling.¹⁰⁷

Nonetheless, Grützmacher concludes with a negative assessment of the work as a whole: Jerome's greatest work was only a translation and not a product of the creative spirit like Augustine's.¹⁰⁸

105 Ibid., 108. According to Grützmacher, Jerome lacked grammatical understanding (as did his rabbinic helpers). For he treated *matres lectionis* as vowels, confused gutturals, and did not distinguish between *shin* and *sin*, as well as ignored established rules about construct, tenses of verbs, and sentence formation.

106 Ibid., 109. Grützmacher has difficulty describing the style of translation in part because he relies on Jerome's writings on the subject more than the translation itself. In *Epist.* 57 Jerome says he must translate the Bible word for word because the order is a mystery, but in *Epist.* 106.3:54–55, he says that it is better to translate according to the sense in order to render peculiarities of particular languages. Perhaps, concludes Grützmacher, Jerome follows this later principle. He does avoid quick changes of person so common in the Hebrew, uses Latin periods instead of parataxis, does not hesitate to subtract, and permits explanatory additions. See below, pp. 51–54, 67–70, 98–99.

107 Ibid.

108 “Aber es ist auch bezeichnend, dass die grösste Leistung seines Lebens kein eigenes Werk, sondern eine Übersetzung war. Er war eben kein produktiver Geist wie Augustin. . . .” (Ibid., 110). On the negative view of translation as a whole see Lori Chamberlain, “Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation,” in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 314–29. Taking issue with assumptions such as Grützmacher's, she argues that the feminine analogies of translation reflect and promote the negative view of translation as a whole. Metaphors include descriptions of writing as “productive” and “masculine” but translation as “reproductive” and “feminine” (314); the “unfaithful beauty” (315); fidelity (317); and colonization (318). Sometimes the source text is feminized (“mother tongue”) and translation masculinized as the seducer or the oedipal child killing the father or the colonizer. This also reflects larger issues of western culture: engendered power relations, the desire to equate language with morality, the quest for originality and unity, the intolerance of duplicity (322). Translation can be problematic on a deeper level because it effaces the difference between production and reproduction (322).

Scholarship on the translation of the Bible (*iuxta Hebraeos*) tends to expand upon or reiterate the categories laid out by Grützmacher with one exception: the issue of whether the Vulgate is a good or bad translation no longer concerns scholars.¹⁰⁹ Scholars still examine reasons for translating directly from the Hebrew,¹¹⁰ the character of the translation, his qualifications¹¹¹ and the principles of his method.¹¹² The character of his translation is approached from three directions: his sources, his method, and the end result.¹¹³ The approach to these topics stems either from isolated, selected passages or from concentration on a particular book.¹¹⁴ As for his sources, he may draw on the Greek

109 Even Grützmacher qualified his negative assessment of the translation.

110 Sparks, "Jerome as a Biblical Scholar," 513–15 and Dennis Brown, "Jerome and the Vulgate," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation, Vol. 1: The Ancient Period*, ed. A. J. Hauser and D. F. Watson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 359. Eva Schulz-Flügel, "The Latin Old Testament Tradition," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. I: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*, ed. Magne Saebø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 643 attributes these rationales to a uniquely Western setting: in the West the Bible was only available in translated form; it did not always work in controversies with Jews; the Latin translation was viewed as linguistically inferior with clumsy, colloquial style; and the large number of versions supported comparative translation technique.

111 The question of Jerome's Hebrew ability, once a scholarly crux, now generates nuance rather than new angst. Jerome had an extensive knowledge of the Hebrew language which did not prevent him from making mistakes and deriving Hebrew erudition from Greek as well as Jewish sources; see above pp. 23–25 and Newman, "How Should We Measure," 131–40.

112 Sparks, "Jerome as Biblical Scholar," 522–27.

113 Sparks, "Jerome as Biblical Scholar," 518, 527.

114 For Genesis, see Felix Reuschenbach, "Hiernonymus als Übersetzer der Genesis" (PhD diss., Freiburg, 1942); for Samuel, see Victor Aptowitzer, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata I: Die Bücher Samuelis," *ZAW* 19 (1909), 241–52; for Proverbs, see Gordon, "Rabbinic Exegesis"; for Psalms, see Colette Estin, *Les Psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions juives antérieures* (Rome, Collectanea Biblica Latina 15 (Rome: San Giralomo, 1984) and David Paul McCarthy, "Saint Jerome's Translation of the Psalms: The Question of Rabbinic Tradition," in *Open thou mine eyes...: Essays on Aggadah and Judaica Presented to Rabbi William G. Braude on His Eightieth Birthday and Dedicated to His Memory* [Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1992]; Cameron, "Rabbinic Vulgate"; for Ruth, see Rafael Jiménez Zamudio, "Algunos aspectos fonéticos y morfológicos de las versiones latinas del Libro de Rut," *Cuadernos de filología clásica Estudios latinos* 2.26 (2006): 103–19; for Daniel, see Régis Courtray, "Jérôme, traducteur du 'Livre de Daniel,'" *Pallas* 75 (2007): 105–24; for 1 and 2 Ezra, see Dieter Böhler, "'Treu und schön' oder nur 'treu'?: Sprachästhetik in den Esrabüchern," in *Im Brennpunkt: die Septuaginta*, ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Dieter Böhler, BWANT [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007], 3:97–105; and for Tobit

tradition, Classical tropes, or Jewish traditions.¹¹⁵ Perhaps it is better to speak of an approach rather than a method:¹¹⁶ the approach may vary from one biblical book to another but has been characterized as philological, theological, rhetorical and classical.¹¹⁷ Rather than characterize his translation based on how he arrived there, some focus on the end result, a work of late antique Latin literature or a stage in the history of biblical interpretation.¹¹⁸ No one has produced

see Vincent T. M. Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit Compared With Other Ancient Witnesses* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000).

- 115 On the influence of Greek tradition, see below chapter 4. On the influence of Jewish traditions see chapter 5. On Classical traditions, see chapters 3 and 6.
- 116 McCarthy, "Saint Jerome's Translation," e.g., properly adopts a holistic approach to describe the method of translating. He considers Jerome's intellect, whole person, historical situation, and examines his decisions to reveal his interests, intentions, influences and insights. His translation technique reveals "literary Latin, wide use of synonyms, interest in Septuagint transliterations, more precise renderings of the LXX, avoidance of Grecisms," overturning established Latin translations, carryovers from the Septuagint, knowledge of Hebrew, words learned from his *Book of Hebrew Names*, "Hebrew homonyms serving as mnemonics, help from the Hexapla especially for vocabulary, hexaplaric syntax, connotations from the Greek world, hexaplaric nuances, and influences from earlier Greek translators" (156). McCarthy concludes that 1H Psalms is basically a revision of earlier LXX Psalms, shows slight control of Hebrew, is primarily influenced by Aquila, has some dependence on Symmachus and rarely uses Quinta, and reveals little evidence of rabbinic influence (188–90).
- 117 For philological, see John S. Cameron, "The Vir Triculus. An Investigation of Classical, Jewish and Christian Influences on Jerome's Translation of the Psalter *iuxta Hebraeos*" (PhD diss., Oxford, 2006) and Cameron, "Rabbinic Vulgate"; for theological, see Schulz-Flügel, "Latin Old Testament Tradition," 644; for rhetorical, see Neil Adkin, "Biblia Catilinaria," *Maia* 55 (2003): 93–98; and for classical, see Catherine Brown Tkacz, "*Labor tam utilis*: The Creation of the Vulgate," *VC* 50 (1996): 42–72.
- 118 For focus on the Vulgate as a late antique Latin text, see the articles of Catherine Brown Tkacz and Neil Adkin. As a stage in the history of biblical interpretation, notable are the seven references to the Vulgate in James Kugel, *The Bible as It Was* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), where Kugel gathers interpretations of specific Pentateuchal texts from a variety of Jewish and Christian sources and periods. He also includes references to other biblical versions—Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion etc. (667–70). Representative of how his approach differs from the magisterial work of Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909–38), Kugel concentrates on the exegesis of specific verses rather than the common appearance of narrative tropes. One still encounters cases where the Vulgate is ignored in the history of interpretation. Typical is Brown, "Jerome and the Vulgate." In the section "Biblical Interpretation," he discusses techniques and letters and commentaries not translation (364–71); e.g., he notes the use of Jewish interpretations of biblical passages but refers only to commentaries (370). This is in marked contrast to other chapters in the same

a comprehensive study of the translation that integrates an analysis of his sources, methods, the character(s) of his translation set within its late antique context.¹¹⁹ As will become clear, concentrating on exegetical elements in his translation of the book of Exodus produces this kind of integrative study.

Methodological issues raised by previous attempts to identify exegetical traditions in Jerome's biblical translations clarifies the need for a new approach to the study of the exegetical technique in the Vulgate. Some of these identifications require renewed scrutiny because isolating exegetical elements in the Vulgate demands careful comparison with the Hebrew, Greek, and Old Latin versions of the Bible as well as careful consideration of interpretive traditions. We find a number of cases that become questionable upon closer investigation. Sometimes this is the result of having not adequately compared all of Jerome's potential sources.¹²⁰ For example, Felix Reuschenbach classifies *sed* 'but' as a uniquely Hieronymian addition to Gen 23:15, but the Septuagint also has $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$.¹²¹

volume, such as Martin McNamara, "Interpretation of Scripture in the Targumim" in *A History of Biblical Interpretation, vol. 1: The Ancient Period*, ed. A. J. Hauser and D. F. Watson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 167–97 and Leonard Greenspoon, "Hebrew Into Greek: Interpretation In, By, and Of the Septuagint," esp. 86–99.

119 One exception might be Reuschenbach, "Hiernonymus." His table of contents includes sections on the LXX and Greek versions as well as Jewish traditions. Unfortunately, the book only includes the first part, covering stylistic features of the translation. Two more recent exceptions are Cameron, "Vir Triculus" and Sebastian Weigert, *Übersetzungsprinzipien und Quellen der Deuteronomiumübersetzung des Hieronymus* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2016). Cameron adopts a comprehensive method, but Classical and Jewish exegetical influence are limited for Vg Psalms and he is primarily interested in demonstrating these influences are subordinate to the Christian purpose and character of the translation. I have similarly argued elsewhere that Jerome mediates a Christian message through rabbinic and Classical interpretive traditions (Matthew Kraus, "Christian, Jews and Pagans in Dialogue: Saint Jerome on Ecclesiastes 12:1–7," *HUCA* 70–71 [1999–2000]: 183–231). Weigert's excellent work properly compares the Vg with the Hebrew and versions to highlight the rabbinic influence. He does not focus on the the Late Antique Classical context. Rabbinic influence on the Vulgate is usually ignored in surveys of the history of biblical interpretation as in Brown, "Jerome and the Vulgate," 364–71.

120 In fairness, essential resources such as the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint have not been available until relatively recently. See below, chapter 4.

121 Reuschenbach, "Hiernonymus," 63. The vast majority of the examples listed by Reuschenbach are indeed unique to Jerome, but one must always consult the Greek.

who recommending the translation ‘phoenix’ (the bird).¹³⁰ The Greek word for the fabled bird φοῖνιξ (phoenix) can also mean ‘palm tree’. Jerome hears “phoenix” from his Jewish informant but renders as the tree rather than the bird. Yet the Septuagint, which has ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος ‘like the stump of the palm tree’, would be a more logical source. This is confirmed by Jerome’s rendition of Job according to the Septuagint (*Dixi enim, aetas mea senescet, sicut arbor palmae multo vivam tempore. radix mea patet ad aquas*) which already has *palma*. It seems to me far more likely that the Septuagint incorporates the Jewish tradition.¹³¹ So we have a conundrum: either he derived *palma* from his Jewish informant, or he derived it from the Septuagint. We could argue that, under the influence of Jewish tradition, he restored the Septuagint to its original form by rendering only φοῖνιξ instead of στέλεχος φοίνικος. A neglected piece of evidence, however, permits a simpler explanation. For the four collocations of στέλεχος and φοῖνιξ (Exod 15:27; Num 33:9; Sir 50:12; and Job 29:18), the Latin omits rendering στέλεχος in Exodus, Numbers, and Job. As he did not work on Ben Sira, we can safely conclude that he consistently translated the combination στέλεχος φοίνικος as *palma*.

Examples of Classical influence must also be reconsidered at times. Neil Adkin shows how the rendition of Judg 20:25, **וַיֵּצֵא בְנֵימִן | לִקְרֹאתָם | מִן־הַגִּבְעָה בַּיּוֹם**, ‘Benjamin went out toward them from Gibeah on the second day and they slaughtered the Israelites’, as *eruperunt filii Beniamin de portis Gabaa et occurrentes eis tanta in illos caede baccati sunt* ‘Benjaminites burst forth from the gates of Gibeah and meeting them raged like a bacchant

¹³⁰ The Jewish tradition can be found in the Talmud, b. Sanh. 108b אבא אשכחניה דהויה רבינא ור' יוחנן בשם ר' חנין בר' יהושע דספרא דמלכות אמר ליה לא בעית מוזוני? אמר ליה: חזיתך דהות טרידא, אמינא לא אצערך. אמר ליה יהא רעוא דלא תמות, שנאמר (איוב כ"ט) ואמר עם קני וגוע וכחול ארבה המים. The Talmud connects the verse in Job to the reading חול as a long-lived bird rather than sand. The specific connection between חול, the phoenix, and the verse from Job appears in Gen. Rab. 19.5 וחול (כט) (איוב כט) ה"ד ושמו חול, וה"ד (איוב כט) חול, ובסוף אלף שנה הוא חי, ובסוף אלף שנה איש יוצאה מקנו ושורפתו, ומשתיר בו כביצה וחזור ומגדל אברים וחי. It is strange that Kedar-Kopfstein does not cite the earlier and more convincing reference in Genesis Rabbah.

131 Also, the Talmud refers to the *אורשניה*, not ‘phoenix’. Even if we allow that the reading of Job 29:18 in Genesis Rabbah (above, n. 130) clearly does define *חור* as the phoenix bird, we still must explain the origin of the LXX reading. One might argue that the Septuagint has *στέλεχος φοίνικος*, not *φοίνικος* alone and that *στέλεχος* could not possibly derive from *חור*. I conjecture that the Septuagint originally had *φοίνιξ* alone and then *στέλεχος* was interpolated for clarity. Such a possibility is not so far-fetched since, of the eleven times *στέλεχος* appears in the Greek Bible, four include a collocation with *φοίνιξ* (Exod 15:27; Num 33:9; Sir 50:12; and, of course, Job 29:18).

against them with such great slaughter' parallels Cicero's *In Catalinam* 4.11. (*et furor in vestra caede bacchantis*).¹³² While Adkin convincingly demonstrates the similarity between *caede baccati sunt* and *caede bacchantis*, he underdetermines its interpretive significance. Adkin attributes the parallel to Jerome's magpie memory, so it is simply a Ciceronian turn of phrase without any connection to the context. Here is where his analysis could benefit from a thicker description. The fact that Jerome renders the same Hebrew in Judg 20:21 (וַיִּשְׁחָטוּ) as *occiderunt* suggests that the change of phrase was intended. In fact, he also varies נָצַח 'go out' from *egressi* in 20:21 to *eruperunt* in 20:25.¹³³ So he drew on the metaphor of slaughter in a bacchanalian frenzy to make a direct allusion to the context of Fourth Catiline, near the end of the Catilinian conspiracy. Judg 20:25 describes the second attack of the Benjaminites, which is the final story in the book of Judges and also a kind of civil war. Moreover, Judges ends with the famous phrase, "in those days there was no king in Israel and each one did what seemed right to himself"—a most apt description of the last years of the Roman republic including the activity of Catiline.¹³⁴

I am not claiming that these methods are inherently flawed, but rather advocating for a more holistic and thorough approach. This applies as well to the data set. Vulgate scholars focus either on decontextualized phrases or isolated issues.¹³⁵ Even studies that focus on a particular book can narrow their investigation to a particular issue such as competence in Hebrew. We can learn a great deal from such studies, but a focus on the book of Exodus as a whole offers a number of advantages. In addition to including narrative, legal, and poetic sections, the book belongs to his most developed translation, the Pentateuch,

132 Adkin, "Biblia Catilinaria."

133 Jerome also varies where the Greek does not:

20:21 A—καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ υἱοὶ Βενιαμιν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ διέφθειραν.

20:25 A—καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Βενιαμιν εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς Γαββα ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ διέφθειρεν ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ.

and 20:21 B—καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ υἱοὶ Βενιαμιν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαββα καὶ διέφθειραν.

20:25 B—καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ υἱοὶ Βενιαμιν εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαββα ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ διέφθειραν ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ.

134 *In diebus illis non erat rex in Israhel sed unusquisque quod sibi rectum videbatur hoc faciebat* (Judg 21:25). Similarly, the repetition of the Ciceronian phrase in his comment on Hos 4:15 fits the context of a rebellious Israel (Adkin, "Biblia Catilinaria," 94).

135 On the problems of an atomistic analysis see Theo A. W. Van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*, CBET 47 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 7 and W. Edward Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*, VTSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 15, 21, 24.

and can shed light on the impact of his technical works—the *Onomastica* and *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*—on his translation. Moreover, apart from individual verses, Exodus has received little attention. To be sure, other studies have focused on individual books, especially Psalms.¹³⁶ The book of Psalms, however, does not seem to be representative of his work. Each psalm is a distinct pericope rather than part of a connected narrative; the exegetical tradition on Psalms was far less developed than, for example, on the Pentateuch; and the external evidence clearly indicates that he depended heavily on textual sources for his rendering of Psalms. Not only did he revise the translation of the Psalms three times, he also felt constrained by the liturgical use of the book. Moreover, a comparison of *Epistle* 106 and *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* (and his subsequent commentaries) indicates two different approaches to the biblical text. In the letter, he discusses minute textual issues in Psalms, often referring to the Hebrew, Greek, Septuagint and versions. This accounts for Cameron's conclusion that his translation of Psalms is philological, not a rabbinic Vulgate.¹³⁷ In the *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, however, he incorporates exegetical traditions into his close textual discussions. A translation of Genesis based on *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, for instance, would be more like a targum. Of course, I think Cameron's formulation of the question is problematic in the first place because Jerome never even claimed to model the Vulgate on a rabbinic translation.

1.5 Summary

Jerome's biography, recent developments in Hieronymian studies, and the need to update and expand previous studies of the *iuxta Hebraeos* justify the examination of whether or not *recentiores*-rabbinic philology is the translation technique of Vg Exodus. Whereas the background and training of the LXX translators remain a mystery, we know that Jerome had a Classical education in Latin grammar and literature, was intimately acquainted with the Greek textual tradition through Origen's Hexapla and his own initial attempts to revise the Bible according to the Septuagint, and had access to the "Hebrew Truth" through his own knowledge of Hebrew and Jewish consultants. Since he applied these skills in his biblical works such as the *Onomastica* on Hebrew names and places, *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, and the rest of his biblical commentaries, it is reasonable to test whether the biblical translation reflects the same

¹³⁶ See above, n. 114.

¹³⁷ See discussion of Cameron, "Rabbinic Vulgate," above, pp. 28–31.

method. Unpacking the process of translation clearly belongs to the trend in Hieronymian studies toward seeking objective knowledge about this Church Father more than an understanding of his discursive self-representation. And in this regard, previous studies on the Vulgate itself require some correction and updating because an atomistic approach that does not consider all textual and cultural contexts can produce questionable results that require a reassessment of the evidence of interpretive traditions. For example, the so-called exegetical renditions cited by Kedar-Kopfstein and Cameron may not be rabbinic. While the comprehensive approach to the Vulgate of this study considers Hebrew, Greek, rabbinical traditions, and Latin philology, with a focus on the actual implementation of Jerome's translation technique, it is not completely divorced from interest in his self-representation. Just as the multifaceted late antique culture defines the parameters of the discursive expression of his identity, it also provides the impetus of reading Vg Exodus as an integrated interaction of Christian, Jewish, and Classical traditions. In the exegetical moments where we perceive this interaction, we catch a glimpse of the translator's identity. His discursive identity becomes actualized through the translation. The question is not whether the Vulgate is a rabbinic targum, but whether it is a late antique targum, in other words, a translation whose exegetical elements reflect and respond to the late antique cultural context. Nevertheless, before broadening discussion to the late antique milieu, we have to consider Jerome's direct encounter with the Hebrew. For identifying a free rendering as "exegetical" requires understanding the degree of literalism and freedom of the translator's technique. A free rendition is not always related to an exegetical tradition since it could represent a plausible reading of the Hebrew alone. The next chapter examines the literalness and freedom of the Vulgate from two angles: how Jerome theorizes about biblical translation technique and his actual practice.

Translation Technique of the Vulgate

2.1 Preliminary Remarks on Method

It is generally agreed that Jerome's Hebrew *Vorlage* corresponds with the current MT, especially for the Pentateuch.¹ How he engaged with the Hebrew text of the Bible is the subject of this chapter. While the text itself is our primary source for identifying his translation technique, we do have his programmatic statements about translation at our disposal as well. These must be used with caution, a point that becomes clearer from a brief comparison between Jerome's methodology and the methodology of the Septuagint. The so-called methodological statements on translation of the Septuagint are literally the stuff of legend. Two well-known myths account for the origin of the Septuagint. According to the so-called Letter of Aristeas, King Ptolemy of Egypt requests that the high priest in Jerusalem assist him in acquiring an accurate translation of the Torah.² The high priest dutifully dispatches a group of educated elders who collaborate on a translation subsequently endorsed by the king and canonized by the Alexandrian Jewish community.³ Philo's account resembles

- 1 Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Vulgate as a Translation" (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1968) 71, although he adds that Jerome sometimes consulted Hebrew manuscripts with some variants. See also E. F. Sutcliffe, "St. Jerome's Hebrew Manuscripts," *Bib* 29 (1948): 195–204 and Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Latin Translations," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling, CRINT 2.1 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 322. In fact, the Vulgate has little text-critical value for the Hebrew Bible because it is so close to the Masoretic Text (Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd rev. ed. [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012], 152–53).
- 2 Editions of the Greek text include H. St. J. Thackeray, "Appendix: The Letter of Aristeas," in *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, by Henry B. Swete, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 531–606 and Andre Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, index complet des mots grecs* (Paris: Cerf, 1962). For an English translation, see, R. J. H. Shutt, "Letter of Aristeas: A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 2:7–34.
- 3 See especially §311: πάντων δ' ἐπιφωνησάντων τοῖς εἰρημένοις, ἐκέλευσαν διαράσασθαι, καθὼς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἔστιν, εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθεὶς ἢ μεταφέρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιούμενος ἀφαίρεσιν, καλῶς τοῦτο πράσσοντες, ἵνα διὰ παντὸς ἀέννα καὶ μένοντα φυλάσσηται. "There was general approval of what they said, and they commanded that a curse should be laid, as was their custom, on anyone who should alter the version by any addition or change

Aristeas' in most of the details with one striking exception.⁴ Working independently in isolation, the translators miraculously produce identical renditions from Hebrew into Greek, "as if guided by an invisible prompter."⁵ Much has been written about these legends, including the various accretions to Philo's miraculous story.⁶ But this attention to the undeniably wondrous agreement between Philo's translators of the Septuagint obscures an additional but far less fantastic difference from Aristeas' account. The translators not only work independently from each other, they also work independently with the Hebrew text. In Aristeas' account, in contrast, the translators compare versions of the Greek before agreeing to a definitive text.⁷ In Philo, however, the elders translate from the Hebrew alone. Jerome, although he explicitly endorses Aristeas' account,⁸ embodies both approaches to translation. We will see in the subsequent chapters how Jerome, like Aristeas' elders, compares his Latin version with his Greek and Latin *Vorlagen* and exegetical traditions.⁹ In this chapter, I consider his encounter with the Hebrew alone, like one of the philonic scholars sequestered in his cell. Indeed, Philo himself notes that it is the characteristics of the original language and the language of translation requiring editorial

to any part of the written text, or any deletion either. This was a good step taken, to ensure that the words were preserved completely and permanently in perpetuity: (translation from Shutt, "Letter of Aristeas," 33).

4 Philo, *Mos.* 2.25–44 (Colson, LCL).

5 Philo, *Mos.* 2.37.

6 See, for example, Sidney Jellicoe, ed., *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (New York: Ktav, 1974); Andre Pelletier, "Josephus, the Letter of Aristeas, and the Septuagint," in *Josephus, the Bible and History*, ed. Louis Feldman and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 97–115; Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge, 2003); Noah Hacham, "The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story?," *JSJ* 36.1 (2005): 1–20; Abraham Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*, ed. David Wasserstein (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); and Giuseppe Veltri, *Libraries, Translations, and 'Canonic' Texts: The Septuagint, Aquila, and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement* 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

7 See §302: οἱ δὲ ἐπετέλουν ἕκαστα σύμφωνα ποιοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἀντιβολαῖς· τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῆς συμφωνίας γινόμενον πρεπόντως ἀναγραφῆς οὕτως ἐτύγχανε παρὰ Δημητρίου. 'They set to completing their several tasks, reaching agreement among themselves on each by comparing versions. The result of their agreement thus was made into a fair copy by Demetrius' (translation from Shutt, "Letter of Aristeas," 33).

8 Jerome, *Prolog. Pent.*

9 On Jerome as a textual critic, see Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 41–53.

decisions that would make agreement among seventy-two translators virtually impossible.¹⁰ Similarly, I analyze examples where Hebrew and Latin meet directly, unmediated through previous translations and traditions.

2.2 The Sense of *Sensus*

Much has been written about the character of the Vulgate based on analyzing the text itself and programmatic statements about translation, especially *Epistle* 57 where Jerome promotes non-literal translation except in the case of the Bible.¹¹ While not the primary focus of this study, nevertheless, identifying exegetical moments in Vg Exodus does contribute insights particularly on the disconnect between what he says about translation and what he does when he translates the Bible. To be sure, he does not have a consistent, formulaic, unified strategy for translating the Bible.¹² He is, however well known for the famous distinction between word-for-word and sense-for-sense translations.¹³ A consideration of what he means by *sensus* demonstrates that he consistently applies his general understanding of *sensus* when he translates.

Jerome's understanding of *sensus* is complex and rich:

It is enough for now to cite Hilary the Confessor, who translated the Homilies on Job and many treatises on Psalms into Latin from the

10 καίτοι τις οὐκ οἶδεν, ὅτι πᾶσα μὲν διάλεκτος, ἡ δ' Ἑλληνικὴ διαφερόντως, ὀνομάτων πλουτεῖ, καὶ ταῦτ' ἐνθύμημα οἶόν τε μεταφράζοντα καὶ παραφράζοντα σχηματίζει πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα ἐφαρμόζοντα λέξεις (Philo, *Mos.* 2.38).

11 In *Epist* 57.5, Jerome explicitly states that he translates according to the sense, and not word for word, *except* in the case of Scripture, “where even the order of the words is a mystery” *absque Scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est* (translation from Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series*, trans. William H. Fremantle, G. Lewis, and W. G. Martley [Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature, 1893] 6:214). See Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus: Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57). Ein Kommentar*, *Mnemosyne Supplement* 61 (Leiden: Brill, 1980) and Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 104–9.

12 See above, pp. 34–36 and Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 109.

13 E.g., Werner Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 17–44; Pierre Jay, *L'exegese de saint Jerome d'apres son 'Commentaire sur Isaie'* (Paris: Etudes augustiniennes, 1985), esp. 89–110, 142–47; and Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 121–66. Jay and Brown focus more on the use of these terms in exegesis, namely the literal and spiritual sense of the biblical text.

Greek. . . . He transferred the sense into his own language as if captives in accordance with the rights of a conqueror (*Epist* 57.6.3).¹⁴

He utilizes a powerful metaphor to describe the process of translation: “He transferred the sense into his own language as if captives in accordance with the rights of a conqueror” (*quasi captivos sensus in suam linguam victoris iure transposuit*). By closely considering this comparison to military law, it is possible to identify the framework by which he understands the process of translation. The battle metaphor immediately points to a tension between the source language and target language. In his view, then, the target language dominates. However, the polyvalent meaning of language would render such an observation too vague for any heuristic value if Jerome did not also identify the “combatants” as the *sensus*. Therefore, *sensus* represents a key term for unlocking his theory of translation. I contend that his attempt to capture the *sensus* impels him to invade the territory of exegetical traditions.

To Jerome, in the context of translation, *sensus* is a two-tiered concept. On one level, primarily philological, *sensus* refers to the integration of lexicography, morphology, and style, as opposed to *verbum* which pays sole attention to lexicography and morphology. Every unit of meaning in the source text must have an exact equivalent in the target translation. On another level, primarily spiritual, *sensus* refers to the understanding in a religious context. To be sure, the philological *sensus* is the predominate concern in translation while the spiritual *sensus* plays a more central role in his commentaries.¹⁵ Moreover, according to Pierre Jay, in the commentaries, Jerome associates the “Hebrew Truth” with the literal sense of Scripture and the Septuagint with the spiritual sense.¹⁶ Therefore, we would expect a word-for-word translation directly from the Hebrew. Nevertheless, in both translation and commentaries, these concepts of *sensus* overlap. In the commentaries, Jerome sometimes cites Hebrew for the spiritual sense and the Septuagint for the literal reading.¹⁷

14 *Sufficit in praesenti nominasse Hilarium confessorem, qui homilias in Iob et in psalmos tractatus plurimos in Latinum vertit e Graeco . . . quasi captivos sensus in suam linguam victoris iure transposuit.* Translation mine.

15 Jay, *L'exegese* and Brown, *Vir Trilinguis* discuss extensively the application of literal sense and spiritual sense in Jerome's commentaries.

16 Jay, *L'exegese*, 142–43.

17 Jay, *L'exegese*, 143–44.

This overlap appears to be countered in *Epistle 57 Ad Pammachium* where he clarifies the concept of *sensus* especially by contrasting it to *verbum*.¹⁸ Here he declares his basic principle for translating:

For I not only admit, but freely proclaim that when translating from the Greek (except in the case of Holy Scriptures, where the word order is the Mystery), I render not word for word, but sense for sense (57.5).¹⁹

The phrase, *absque scripturis sanctis* ‘except in the case of Holy Scriptures’, however, need not trouble us because he ignores this in practice²⁰ and even contradicts himself in the latter part of the letter. Moreover, since he wrote the letter in the early stages of his biblical translation (395/396), it is possible that his approach to the Bible became more flexible as a result of actually translating. Not only does this idea of chronological development correspond with the conclusion of Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein that his later biblical translations were less slavish than his earlier ones,²¹ it is also reasonable to expect that his predisposition to a *sensum ad sensum* translation eventually overrode *verborum ordo mysterium est* ‘the word order is a mystery’. In addition, he precisely defines what a sense for sense translation entails: “time prevents me from saying how many things [Cicero] omitted, how many things he added, how many things he changed in his translation in order to clarify the characteristics (*proprietas*) of the foreign language through the characteristics (*proprietas*) of his own language” (Epist. 57.5.2).²² While *proprietas* refers to proper lexicography,²³ *hyperbatorum anfractus* ‘circuitousness of hyperbaton’

18 See Bartelink, *Hieronymus*.

19 *Ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteor me in interpretatione Graecorum absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu*. Translation adapted from Schaff and Wace, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 6:214. According to Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 111 Jerome disregards the principle of word-for-word translation in the case of the Bible for three reasons: the nature of the language, his rhetorical education, and theological considerations.

20 Bartelink, *Hieronymus*, 44–45.

21 Kedar-Kopfstein, “Vulgate as a Translation,” 284–85.

22 Quanta [Cicero] in illis praetermisit, quanta addiderit, quanta mutaverit, ut proprietates alterius linguae suis proprietatibus explicaret non est huius temporis dicere(). Translation mine.

23 See the passages with *proprietas* collected from Jerome by Bartelink, *Hieronymus*, 52–53; e.g., *lacum, quem nequaquam debemus, iuxta latini sermonis proprietatem, eum intellegere, qui graece λίμνη dicitur . . . , sed quas nos solemus cisternas appellare* (Jerome, *Comm. Ezech.* 10.32.17).

and *dissimilitudines casuum* ‘differences between the cases’ indicate style and morphology as aspects of a text’s *sensus* (5.7). Furthermore, he cites Cicero to delineate the stylistic elements of *sententiae* ‘turns of phrase’, *figurae* ‘figures of speech’, and *rerum ordo* ‘order of topics’ as subcategories of *sensus* (5.4). The examples of Terence, Plautus, and Caecilius illustrate that a *sensus ad sensum* translation preserves *decus* ‘charm’ and *elegantia* ‘elegance’ rather than “clinging to the words” (*numquid haerent in verbis* [5.5]). In order to explain why style as well as semantics should concern the translator, he makes the bold assertion that a *verbum de verbo* rendition may actually contradict the truth: *Quam vos veritatem interpretationis, hanc eruditi κακοζήλιαν nuncupant* ‘What you call the truth of translation, the learned call this bad taste’ (5.7).²⁴ This is possible because a translation which fails to reproduce an elegant style would unfaithfully imply that the original author lacked literary ability:

He translates Homer into Latin literally—what else can I say—or he translates Homer into Latin prose: he will see an absurd word order and the most gifted poet ever barely able to speak (5.8).²⁵

Thus, by citing Classical authors, he defends and defines the philological *sensus*.

However, the exempla from the New Testament, which includes many biblical translations, simultaneously complicate and clarify his understanding of *sensus*. For example, Jerome reasonably defends Mark 5:41 for adding *tibi dico* ‘I tell you’ to *puella, tibi dico, surge*, ‘arise girl, I tell you’ on the grounds that this is more emphatic and “indicates the sense of summoning and commanding” (*sensum vocantis et imperantis exprimeret* [57.7.1]). Thus, he clearly demonstrates that the New Testament strove for the philological *sensus*. However, it complicates his opinion about biblical translation because it gives apostolic sanction to a non-literal translation of the Aramaic phrase (טליתא קומי). Similarly, he notes that Matt 27:9–10 cites a prophecy from Jeremiah which not only is not found there but also actually appears in Zechariah with words and word order different from both the Septuagint and Hebrew (57.7.2–4). Nonetheless, he defends Matthew’s translation on the grounds that the sense is the same (*cum sensus idem sit*) and that Matthew is interested in the spiritual sense (*cui curae fuit non verba et syllabas aucupari, sed sententias domatum*

²⁴ Translation mine.

²⁵ *Homerum ad verbum exprimat in Latinum—plus aliquid dicam—, eundem sua in lingua prosae verbis interpretetur: videbit ordinem ridiculum et poetam eloquentissimum vix loquentem.* Translation mine.

ponere [7.4]). Such license defended on spiritual grounds likewise appears in his explanation for Matt 26:31 where the speaker is God rather than the prophet Zechariah (13.7).²⁶ Many such examples encourage him to conclude that the evangelists and Paul translated the Bible sense for sense (9.8):

From all these examples it is clear the apostles and gospel writers had sought the sense not the word in their translation of the Old Testament and they did not care especially about word-order and phrases when the material was clearly understood (57.9).²⁷

In contrast to the example of the New Testament, he cites Aquila as a negative model, *proselytus et contentiosus interpres, qui non solum verba, sed etymologias verborum transferre conatus est, iure proicitur a nobis* ‘the proselyte and polemical translator, who not only tried to render the exact words, but also the etymologies, is rightly rejected by us’ (57.11.2). This exemplum also contradicts his previous claim that the *sensus ad sensum* translation does not apply to Scripture since he castigates the paragon of *verbum ad verbum* translations. Thus, the step toward an *ad sensum* translation of the Bible becomes a logical consequence of the line of argument in *Epistle* 57. Moreover, the exempla from the New Testament and Aquila promote both understandings of *sensus*. The former justifies capturing the spiritual *sensus* in a translation. The latter, the critique of Aquila, invites attention to style as well as semantics—in other words, the philological *sensus*. Both aspects of *sensus* guide Jerome’s rendition of the book of Exodus.

26 *loco iuxta quorundam prudentiam evangelista piaculi reus est, quod ausus sit prophetas verba ad Dei referre personam.*

27 *Ex quibus omnibus perspicuum est apostolos et evangelistas in interpretatione veterum scripturarum sensum quaesivisse, non verba nec magnopere de ordinatione sermonibusque curasse, cum res intellectui paterent.* Translation mine. The letters and commentaries contain numerous reference to the New Testament’s *sensus ad sensum* translations; see Bartelink, *Hieronymus*, 70–72. Bartelink(72) identifies four explanations offered by Jerome for the evangelists’ and the apostle’s free translation of the Bible: they cited from memory (Jerome, *Comm. Gal.* 1.3), Paul had different Hebrew manuscripts, he rendered the *sensus* not the *verba* of Scripture, or enemies of Christianity intentionally corrupted certain verses with post resurrection interpolations (Jerome, *Comm. Gal.* 2.3 on *Gal.* 3:13).

2.3 Translation Technique

An analysis of the translation technique for Vg Pentateuch confirms Jerome's commitment to the sense-for-sense translation of the Bible.²⁸ Vg Pentateuch follows the Hebrew closely, but it is freer compared to the Old Latin and other books he translated.²⁹ The Hebraisms demonstrate his literalist technique, while his etymological renderings, exegetical renditions, use of Greek *Vorlagen*, and tendency toward Latin usage represent the his free technique. Most of the examples are drawn from Vg Exodus in keeping with the focus of this study. Several are found in the rest of the Pentateuch but are relevant to Exodus since the five books were translated as a unit.

2.3.1 *Literalisms and Transliterations*

Hebraisms include: proper names not declined: אֶהְרֶן *Aaron* (Exod 4:27);³⁰ common Nouns used figuratively: זְרוּעַ *brachium* (*redimam in brachio excelso*, Exod 6:6) and פִּי־חֶרֶב *os gladii* (*fugavit . . . in ore gladii*, Exod 17:13); Hebraic temporal expressions: שְׁלֹשׁ הַיָּמִים *heri et nudius tertius* (Gen 31:2) for 'formerly'; literal rendering of Hebrew used non-literally: יָם *mare* ('sea' = 'West', Deut 33:23); accusative and ablative after the preposition *in*: וְהָיוּ לְאִתָּהּ *et sint in signa* (Gen 1:14); cardinal for ordinal number: יוֹם אֶחָד *dies unus* (Gen 1:5); rendering of Hebrew repetitions in unidiomatic Latin: לְדֹר וּלְדֹר *in generatione et generatione* (Exod 3:15); infinitive absolute: פָּקַד פִּקְדָּתִי *visitans visitavi* (Exod 3:16); ablative of cognate with modal force: מוֹת יוֹמָת *morte moriatur* (Exod 21:17); causative as *facere* or *dare* with infinitive: וַהֲפֹרְתִי *facere . . . crescere* (Gen 17:6) and וְהִשְׁקָה *dabit . . . bibere* (Num 5:24); other verbs foreign to Latin: יִתְנַחֵם *misereri* (in *in servis suis miserebitur*, Deut 32:36); indefinite subject (normally passive in Latin): קָרָא לְבָאָר בָּאָר *propterea appellavit puteum illum* (Gen 16:14); repetition with prepositions: עַד בְּהֵמָה *ab homine usque ad animantia* (Gen 6:7 meaning both . . . and); translation of names: אֶת הָאוּרִים וְאֶת הַתְּמִימִים *doctrina*

28 These examples are drawn from Matthew Kraus, "Vulgate. Pentateuch," in *Textual History of the Bible Online*, ed. Armin Lange (Leiden: Brill, 2016), <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/textual-history-of-the-bible>. For a fuller list of examples, see William E. Plater and Henry J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926) and Kedar-Kopfstein, "Vulgate as a Translation."

29 According to Kedar-Kopfstein, "Vulgate as a Translation," 284–85, the later translations were less literal than the earlier ones. See also David L. Everson, "The Vetus Latina and the Vulgate of the Book of Exodus," in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 384–85.

30 Cf., לֵוִיִּם *Levitae* (Num 1:47), *Levitis* (Num 3:49), *Levitas* (Num 3:9), *Levitarum* (Lev 25:32).

et veritas (Lev 8:8); etymological renderings: הקמה *stantes segetes* (Exod 22:6 [MT 22:5] but *seges* in Deut 16:9; 23:26); Hebrew technical terms: שבת שבתון *sabbati requies* (Lev 23:3) and פסח *phase* (Lev 23:5); and Hebrew semantics: מפניך *ante faciem* (Exod 34:11). While Hebraisms clearly represent a literal translation technique, they can be integrated with the more free application of Latinisms. For example, in וימרר את חייהם *ad amaritudinem perducebant vitam eorum* ‘they led their life to bitterness’ (Exod 1:14), the Hebrew-sounding periphrasis for וימררו includes the unHebraic abstract *amaritudo*.

2.3.2 *New and Unusual Meanings*

The syntax of the Vg Pentateuch may include unLatin usages that reflect slight Hebrew influence but not necessarily a Hebraism obvious to the reader. These examples very likely illustrate the literalist translation technique insofar as they reflect the predominance of the source text.

Nouns: עולם *saeculum* for time (Gen 6:4; Exod 21:6); **Adjectives:** שמנה *pinguis* ‘fruitful’ (Num 13:21). **Verbs:** ישא *deferre* ‘respect’ (Deut 28:50). **Adverbs:** ערב *factum est vespere* (Gen 1:8) and מלמטה *a deorsum usque sursum* (Exod 26:24); **Pronouns:** genitive used instead of possessive: מקרבך *de medio tui* (Exod 23:25); use of *invicem* even with preposition in place of *se* or *inter se*: ויאמרו איש אל אחיו *locuti sunt ad invicem* (Gen 42:21; alternatively, *mutuo loquebantur* [Gen 37:19] and *alter ad alterum dixerunt* [Num 14:4]); *nullus* ‘no one’ for מי *suscitare nullus audebit* (Num 24:9). **Prepositions:** *ad* ‘according to’ in בצלמנו *ad imaginem nostrum* (Gen 1:26–27); עמו *erga se* ‘towards’ (Gen 31:2); *iuxta* as ‘according to’ for למינו *iuxta genus suum* (Gen 1:10); *per* in oaths: נשבעתי *per memetipsum iuravi* (Gen 22:16); איננו *non est super* for *non superest* (Gen 42:13).

2.3.3 *Free Renderings*

2.3.3.1 Etymologies

quem vocavit Laban tumulus Testis (יגר שהדותא) *et Iacob Acervum Testimonii* (גלעד) *uterque iuxta proprietatem linguae suae* ‘which Laban called “the Tomb of Witness” and Jacob “the Heap of Testimony,” each according to the character of his own language’ (Gen 31:47) with addition (in blue) accounting for both Aramaic and Hebrew terms for the location.

2.3.3.2 Clarifications

A clearer or more specific rendition of the Hebrew also indicates a degree of freedom in translation. **Clarification:** *quod cum vidisset Ham pater Chanaan verenda scilicet patris sui esse nuda* (ערוה אביו) (Gen 9:22), where the Hebrew does not have *verenda scilicet* ‘namely pudenda’; **Semantic specification:**

concilium for דבר (Gen 41:37); *intrinsecus* for בית (Gen 6:14); לב *cogitatio* (Deut 18:21); and יצר *cogitatio* (Gen 6:5). **Qualification:** וישרצו *quasi germinantes* (Exod 1:7) and והכהן הגדול *Pontifex, id est sacerdos maximus* (Lev 21:10). **Superlatives:** קדש הזה מקרא היום *diem celeberrimum atque sanctissimum* (Lev 23:21).

2.3.3.3 Intertextuality

Although for the most part Jerome directly engages with the Hebrew and prefers *variatio*, his renditions can reflect intertextual consistency. **Awareness of previous translation:** *ad imaginem quippe Dei factus est homo* (Gen 9:6) with *quippe* 'to be sure', referencing Gen 1:27 *ad imaginem dei creavit illum*; וינגע *flagellavit autem Dominus Pharaonem plagis maximis* (Gen 12:17), like the Hebrew, foreshadowing the plagues in Exodus; נזיד *pulmentum* (Gen 25:29); and מטעמים *pulmentum* (Gen. 27:4).

2.3.3.4 Relationship to Greek Tradition

Jerome regularly incorporates Greek elements into his translation to be distinguished from drawing on the Septuagint and versions to recover the Hebrew sense. This includes general transliteration of words: *papyrio* (Exod 2:5), *azyma* (Lev 23:6), *pythonicus* (Lev 20:27), and *gyrare* (Gen.30:32); greek inflection: *-n*: *charadriion* 'bustard' (Lev 11:19); syntax: verbs taking genitive *dominari* (Num 16:13). He draws specifically on the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, or Theodotion; or example: גרה *obolos* (Num 3:47) following LXX ὀβολός; וחמשים *et armati* following α' ἑνῶπιςμένοι (Exod 13:18), הקבה *lupanar* following σ' τὸ πορνείον (Num 25:8); and שפתיים ערל *incircumcised labiis* following θ' ἀπερίτμητος τοῖς χεῖλεσιν (Exod 6:12). The Greek tradition is often mediated through the Old Latin, but Jerome deviates more from the Old Latin at least for Genesis and Exodus compared to the Prophets and Writings.³¹

2.3.3.5 Idiomatic Latin

As to be expected when its translator refers to himself as Ciceronian, the Vulgate shows a strong proclivity toward elegant Latin style.³² I will be dis-

31 See Matthew A. Kraus, "Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus *Iuxta Hebraeos* in Relation to Classical, Christian, and Jewish Traditions of Interpretation" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1996) and David L. Everson, "The 'Vetus Latina' and the Vulgate of the Book of Genesis," in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 519–36.

32 Many examples have been collected by Plater and White, *Grammar*; Kedar-Kopfstein, "Vulgate as Translation"; F. Reuschenbach, "Hieronymus als Übersetzer der Genesis" (PhD diss., Freiburg, 1942); and Gonzalo Rubio, "Semitic influence in the history of Latin

cusssing these examples in greater detail in the next chapter because of their importance for understanding the impact of Classical philology on his exegetical renditions. Especially compared to the Old Latin, Vg Pentateuch reflects a tendency toward Classical Latin style. Such renderings, insofar as they represent idiomatic Latin, call attention to the difference between the source language and the target language.

2.3.3.5.1 *Classical Latin*

The following representative examples reveal Jerome's efforts towards elegant Latin style rather than a non-Masoretic *Vorlage*. **Avoidance of Hebraisms:** Hebrew emphasis by repetition מעט מעט rendered as *paulatim atque per partes* (Deut 7:22); asyndeton instead of parataxis as in יהיו בו הנגע בגדיו יהיו *habebit vestimenta* 'he will have clothes' (Lev 13:45); euphemisms such as וכי *si sanatus fuerit qui huiusmodi sustinet passionem* 'if one who undergoes such an experience has been healed' (Lev 15:13). **Subordination and variatio instead of biblical parataxis and repetition:** subordination with participles: והוא ותרפא בו כי טוב הוא *videns eum elegantem abscondit* (Exod 2:2); subordination with ablative absolute: תרועה *clangentibus tubis* (Lev 23:24); subordination with cum clause: ולא יכלה עוד הצפינו *cumque iam celare non posset* (Exod 2:3); *variatio*: מצער *parva . . . modica* (Gen 19:20).³³ **Latin idioms and technical terms:** זקנים *provectae aetatis* 'of extended age' (Gen 18:11); שק *cilicium* 'goathair shirt' (Gen 37:34);³⁴ חול *sabulum* 'coarse sand' (Exod 2:12); and האבות *magos* and הידענים *ariolis* 'soothsayers' (Lev 19:31). **Latin expressions:** לך *absit a te* 'it is useless to you' (Gen 18:25); וכאשר יענו אתו כן ירבה *quantoque opprimebant eos tanto magis multiplicabantur* 'the more they oppressed them, the more they increased' (Exod 1:12); ויאמר *at ille* (Exod 3:5, introduction of direct speech with *at* and demonstrative). **Latin syntax:** subjunctive: the mere

syntax," in *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, ed. P. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 195–239.

33 Reuschenbach has extensively collected instances of *variatio* in Genesis which include: variations in the rendering of complete sentences, substantives, adjectives, verbs, verbs with the same substantives, numerical expressions, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections, particles, and other examples of avoiding monotony ("Hieronymus," 31–50). Syntactic and semantic variations include varying the subject, the voice, participial construction, subordination, numbers, catalogues, constructions, general collective and specific (i.e., *camelos . . . de grege*), concrete and abstract nouns, word order, and two Hebrew words related to the same root (50–56).

34 In addition to denoting a covering used by soldiers and seamen, *cilicia* were also worn by ascetics; see Andrew Cain, *Jerome's Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 321.

presence of the subjunctive is a distinctive representation of the Vulgate's Latinity, and the usage *ex alia mente* as in *videntes filii Dei filias eorum quod essent pulchrae* 'the sons of God, seeing their daughters as beautiful' (Gen 6:2) and *paenituit eum quod hominem fecisset* 'He regretted [one can assume] that He had made humankind' (Gen 6:6) are particularly noteworthy; gerundives/gerunds: להשקות *ad hauriendas aquas* (Exod 2:16); יאכל *comedendi... potestatem* (Lev 22:13); correlatives: והגר הגר בתוככם *tam indigena quam colonus qui peregrinatur apud vos* (Lev 18:26); resumptive relative: ותאמרן *quae responderunt* (Exod 1:19); litotes: כמראה צרעת *haut dubiae leprae* (Lev 13:43). **Latin word play:** קשת *arcum* (Gen 9:13) with תבה *arca* (Gen 9:18).

2.3.3.5.2 Christian Latin

The translation also reflects the influence of late antique Christian Latin. For example, concretized abstract nouns: נזר *sanctificatio* (Num 6:12); abstracts in -or: לבן *albor* (Lev 13:25, 39 whiteness); agents in -sor, -tor: ורכבו *ascensor* (Exod 15:1, not *eques*); diminutives: דלי *situla* 'bucket' (Num 24:7); simple nouns not found in classical Latin such as *papilio* 'tent' and *sanctuarium*; verbal adjectives in -bilis, -atus, -itus and negatives in -in: רמש *motabilis* (Gen 1:21); adjectives in -lis, -atus, -itus: במבצרים *muratus* 'walled' (Num 13:20 [MT 13:19]); adjectives in -anus, -cius, -inus, -osus: עגת מצות *subcinericios panes azymos* 'unleavened bread baked under ash' (Exod 12:39); adjectives compounded with prepositions *cum, per, super, prae*: פתרון *praesagus* (Gen 41:11); adjectives compounded with other words: חנון *misericos* (Exod 34:6); verbs compounded with prepositions: ישקו *Adaquare* (Gen 29:2).

2.4 Identifying an Interpretive Rendering

Given the literalist element of Jerome's translation technique and the possibility that freer renditions can reflect the influence of the target language Latin as well translation universals, how do we know if a rendering depends on an exegetical tradition? In order to avoid over-reading Jerome's translation, I adopt the following specific method for determining whether a rendition is interpretive. I start from the premise that he may operate in three ways when translating: direct consideration of the Hebrew alone, consultation of other translation traditions and, finally, engagement with exegetical traditions.³⁵ By "Hebrew alone" I mean that

35 This scheme is similar to Jerome's implied principles of textual criticism according to Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 53–54: "the character or style of writing," "the sense of the passage,"

his version can be best explained as a rendition of the Hebrew. I discuss not those passages that follow the Hebrew word for word but rather those that may differ from the Hebrew without any exegetical significance and without any evidence of reliance on the Septuagint, *Vetus Latina*, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Although these renditions logically follow from the context, they do point to the issues which concerned him as a translator. When a rendition does not accord with the Hebrew, I do not immediately assume an exegetical tradition. For there is always the possibility that he employs the Septuagint, *Vetus Latina*, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. As we shall see, the analysis of these predecessors illustrates that he employed his sources critically. When his rendition significantly differs from the Hebrew and the later versions, I posit the presence of exegetical traditions, whether Jewish, Classical, or Christian. Although determining exegetical significance can be subjective, I consider only those issues that actually receive commentary, the types of issues which receive commentary, and renditions whose sense in a Latin context radically differ from the Hebrew.

2.5 Conclusion

The translation technique of Vg Exodus can be described as literalist in orientation, with a great degree of freedom in determining the literal meaning. A rendition can reflect the Hebrew, Greek, Classical and Christian Latin or, as I will show later, exegetical traditions. The fact that Jerome usually approaches the Hebrew directly raises an important theoretical point. Since he occasionally resorts to the Septuagint and Christian, Classical, and rabbinic traditions instead of always closely following the Hebrew, he could be charged with inconsistency. This is precisely the critique Kedar-Kopfstein applies to him in his excellent analysis of the Vulgate's character as a translation and seminal work on the direct relationship between the Hebrew and Latin of the Vulgate. In his view, "Jerome displays extreme contradictions" in negotiating a balance between the source language and target language.³⁶ He may endorse translating

and "the word order." I am applying these categories differently, as ways of thinking about translation, not as ways of determining authenticity. Also, there are subcharacteristics within each category as well as additional rubrics in the case of translation.

36 Kedar-Kopfstein, "Latin Translations," 323. Kedar-Kopfstein represents conventional ways of thinking about the quality of a translation, as his major work on the Vulgate (Kedar-Kopfstein, "Vulgate as Translation") preceded the recent trend in translation theory questioning such conventional notions.

according to the sense while offering literal renderings. Alternatively, he may introduce a paraphrastically rendered biblical book with a praise of literalism.³⁷ In addition to this conflict between theory and practice, his practice itself lacks consistency especially because he variably applies and abandons standard linguistic equations. Since he variously employs his Greek and Latin *Vorlagen*, Christian tenets, and Jewish exegesis,³⁸ it is no surprise that Kedar concludes, “[I]n fine, Jerome’s translation displays an unevenness with regard to the guiding principle to an extent unknown from any other classical Bible version.”³⁹ Given this critique, it is unclear what Kedar means by the following:

At any rate, with regards to the varying modes of translating within the Vg, suspending judgement, we should content ourselves to register the facts. It may be that in its very variability, linguistic and translational, there lies the attraction of the Vg.⁴⁰

While claiming to suspend judgment, Kedar wavers between condemning Jerome’s inconsistency and praising its appealing variety. It seems to me rather petty to take Kedar to task for simultaneously criticizing the Vulgate and rejecting his own negative evaluation. After all, he presents a fine description of the direct encounter between the Hebrew and Latin in the Vulgate. Rather, Kedar’s analysis provides a rationale for applying recent developments in translation theory. The fact that Kedar inconsistently assesses Jerome’s inconsistency typifies why contemporary theorists explicitly eschew the utopian quest for a definitive model of the ideal translation.⁴¹ Moreover, inconsistency may

37 See Kedar-Kopfstein, “Latin Translations,” 324 citing Jerome, *Epist.* 57:5–10 and the *Prologus Hester*.

38 Kedar-Kopfstein, “Latin Translations,” 323–334.

39 Kedar-Kopfstein, “Latin Translations,” 326.

40 Kedar-Kopfstein, “Latin Translations,” 329.

41 For example, according to Ortega Y. Gasset, “The Misery and Splendor of Translation,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 93, 98, and 108 the splendor of translation is to bring the reader to the author, but this is ultimately impossible. Therefore, the utopian idea that translation is possible must be rejected. But this does not negate a utopian vision completely. Rather, the good utopian “thinks that because it would be desirable to free men from the divisions imposed by languages, there is little probability that it can be attained; therefore, it can only be achieved in an approximate measure.” It is the desire, not the possibility of translation that motivates the utopian vision.

actually be an inherent, natural feature of translation.⁴² This explains why he does not hebraize consistently, as cited in a number of Kedar's examples. If a translation is a constant negotiation between the source language and target language, it is no wonder that sometimes the target language dominates and sometimes the source language prevails.⁴³ Thus, translation by itself represents an intercultural or intracultural phenomenon that intrinsically defies evaluative judgments based on equivalence and consistency.

Since defining translation as absolute equivalence would make translation by nature impossible, theorists focus on different issues such as describing the process of translating, the effect of translation, the social function of translation, the character and method of the translator, the relationship between the source language and the target language, and the distinction between various types of translations: poetic, prose, functional and ethical.⁴⁴ Thus, Kedar rightly pays lip service to avoiding judgments and in practice focuses on the translator as much as the translation itself.⁴⁵ This theoretical model that focuses

42 See discussion of Savory's contradictory principles of translation in Ernst-August Gutt, "Translation As Interlingual Interpretive Use," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 392–93.

43 Jiří Levý, "Translation As a Decision Process," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 148–59 and Katharina Reiss, "Type, Kind and Individuality of Text: Decision Making in Translation," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 160–71. Translation is a human process, so rather than speak of mechanical consistency, Levy identifies tendencies (152): diverging where several paradigms in the target language account for one lexical unit in the source language or converging where one paradigm in the source language reflects several lexical units in the target language.

44 Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge, 2002) and the essays by various authors collected in Lawrence Venuti, ed., *The Translation Studies Reader* (London; New York: Routledge, 2000).

45 Kedar-Kopfstein's claim that the variability of the Vulgate accounts for its appeal is not convincing because Jerome's Latin reader could not possibly be expected to grasp the intricate relationship between the Hebrew *Urtext* and the Latin. This reflects unsubstantiated assumptions of a learned reader. In nineteenth-century classifications of translations, in addition to translation being seen as a scholar's activity (Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 74), the translation was supposed to return the reader to the original, or help the target language reader become a better reader of the original; see Friedrich Schleiermacher, "From On the Different Methods of Translating," in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 44. If there are such learned, bi- or multilingual readers examining the source and target texts together, they do not seem to me to be that much different from a translator for all intents and purposes.

on the translator and understands variability as a natural consequence of the translation process aptly applies to Jerome. Given his erudition and daily circumstances and the fact that translation constantly involves negotiation between the source language and target language, inconsistency becomes inevitable. We see this negotiation most clearly when he departs from a strictly literal rendition. As Kedar notes, “the noteworthy fact is the latter’s gradual breaking away from such strange sounding literalism rather than his original attachment to it.”⁴⁶ The interpretive translations that follow the sense but are derived directly from the Hebrew alone become particularly illuminating not only because such interpretive moments must be ruled out before attributing a rendition to Greek textual sources or Jewish, Christian, and Classical exegetical traditions. These examples also enable us to understand the relationship between the source language and target language.⁴⁷ Investigating this

In other words, Kedar-Kopfstein’s claim is problematic because he unjustifiably collapses the distinction between reader and translator.

46 Kedar-Kopfstein, “Latin Translations,” 325–326.

47 Yves Bonnefoy, “Translating Poetry,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 188 and Henry Schogt, “Semantic Theory and Translation Theory,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 193–203 distinguish between language as a system and specific utterances. Traditional analyses of translation focus on specific utterances. Poetry, however, which maximizes a source language’s potential, cannot be analyzed through its specific utterances but must be considered in relationship to its linguistic system. Therefore, translating poetry highlights translation as encounter between languages. This is the implication of John Dryden’s argument in “On Translation,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 17–31, his 1680 preface to a translation of Ovid’s *Epistles*, especially when he argues that the translator must be skilled in his/her own language (26). The idea of translation as an encounter between languages is adopted by later writers. Some scholars see the historical relationship between languages reflected in translation; see Paul Valéry, “Variations on the Eclogues,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 118; Vladimir Nabokov, “Problems of Translation: Onegin in English,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 133; and Scheiermacher, “From On the Different Methods.” Others explain how translation allows the source language to positively affect the target language; see Dante Gabriel Rossetti, “Preface to The Early Italian Poets,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 65 and Gasset, “Misery and Splendor.” The encounter between languages positively effects our understanding of the relationship between languages as a whole (Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 74). Octavio Paz, “Translation: Literature and Letters,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago:

irreconcilability can deepen the understanding of a particular language by highlighting its mode of signification.⁴⁸ It is one thing to claim that our biblical translator was schooled in late antique Latin grammar; it is another thing to demonstrate how the Latin language, as conceived by Jerome, determined the framework within which he engaged the Hebrew.

Thus, examining the free renderings based directly on the Hebrew provides a number of insights. By providing a taxonomy of free renditions, we can better understand what stimulates Jerome's exegetical interest. In addition, we can more precisely delineate the relationship between the source language and the target language. We can examine the determinative role played by language, the translator, the reader, and genre in the Latin rendition of the book of Exodus.⁴⁹ The next chapter explores the role of the target language as understood by the translator. Mapping the taxonomy of

University of Chicago Press, 1992), 152–53 notes an historical shift in theorizing about language: in the past translation was understood to prove the universality of one's own language, later translation highlighted the irreconcilability of differences.

- 48 For example, Peter Szondi, "The Poetry of Constancy: Paul Celan's Translation of Shakespeare's Sonnet 105," in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 163–85 takes Walter Benjamin's phrase "intention toward language" in a different direction to refer to consciousness toward language rather than Benjamin's sense of directedness toward a perceived or perceptible object. For Szondi, a translation gives evidence of the use of language by differing from the original in its mode of signification (166–68).
- 49 Positing a determinative role for language must be understood in relation to continuing debate concerning the validity of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Its original formulation—that language determines thought and experience—has long been discounted. Schogt, "Semantic Theory," 194 is typical. Despite his qualified acceptance of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, Schogt rejects its conclusion that communication between languages is not possible. For example, since multiple languages have both tense and aspect in their verbal systems, these abstract notions of time are universal, not determined by language. Nevertheless, the fact that some languages emphasize tense and others aspect indicates that language can influence thought to some extent. Thus, the unique features of each language can impact thought and experience to some degree. While Alexander Ludskanov shows that signs preserve invariant information such as affirmation or greeting, Sapir is correct in that each language represents a separate reality. For example, butter does not mean exactly the same thing in every language; see Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 25, 27. Similarly, John C. Catford rejects Sapir-Whorf by distinguishing between linguistic and cultural untranslatability (separating language from culture). Yuri Lotman, in contrast, notes that the very relation of culture to sign and signification makes linguistic translatability de facto impossible; see Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 37, 40.

translational shifts onto Jerome's knowledge of Latin grammar indicates that late antique philology mediated the encounter between Hebrew and Latin in Vg Exodus. Situating Jerome in his late antique context begins by demonstrating the influence of the Latin grammatical tradition on his translation technique.

Jerome, the Hebrew Text, and Hebrew Grammar

3.1 A Grammatical Approach to Translation

As we have seen, the translation technique gleaned from comparing the Hebrew and Latin directly does not readily correlate with Jerome's theoretical statements on biblical translation. Despite his assertion in *Ep.* 57 that biblical translation requires the literal (*verbum ad verbum*) method, Vg Exodus itself is a free translation. We could explain the free renditions according to the categories of transformation conceived by translation theorists, the best approach available particularly for texts like the Septuagint whose translators remain unknown. In this chapter, however, I show how parallels between late antique philology and the types of translational shift indicate that Latin grammar informed his theory of biblical translation. This is similar to suggestions that the Alexandrian grammatical tradition influenced the LXX translators.¹ Surprisingly, this avenue has not been pursued in the case of the Vulgate even though Jerome's familiarity with the Latin grammatical tradition has been well documented for some time.² As I have argued, Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein's assertion of an inconsistent practice as well as inconsistency between theory and practice requires revision. Although much has been written about these theoretical statements and the actual character of his translation, few scholars, with the exception of Kedar and Sebastian Weigert, have compared Jerome's theoretical statements with his actual translations.³ Kedar and Weigert do not

- 1 Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement* 124 (Boston: Brill, 2008), 1–72. On the influence of grammatical traditions on late antique Christian writers including Jerome see Catherine M. Chin, *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).
- 2 F. Lammert, *De Hieronymo Donati discipulo* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912); Louis Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IV^e–IX^e siècle et édition critique)* (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1981) and above, p. 16. Chin, *Grammar and Christianity*, especially pp. 96–102, highlights the instrumentality of late antique Latin grammar in Jerome's Christianizing of the Bible.
- 3 Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Vulgate as a Translation" (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1968); Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Latin Translations," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling (CRINT 2.1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 299–338; and Sebastian Weigert,

consider Jerome's view of the Latin language, particularly in relationship to Hebrew.⁴ This lacuna has been addressed, in part, by the recent work of Michael Graves.⁵ Graves examines references to Latin grammar in the commentary on Jeremiah and convincingly proves that Jerome applied the techniques of the Latin grammatical tradition to his interpretation of the Hebrew text.⁶ Although Graves does not examine the biblical translation, his work nevertheless makes it possible to consider Jerome's translation technique in relation to the Latin grammatical tradition.⁷ Therefore, the subsequent discussion relies heavily on Graves' work, applying it to 1H Exodus. I will be using Graves' taxonomy of grammatical categories, which is based on late antique Latin grammar.

Latin grammar, emerging from Greek scholarship, traditionally consists of four parts: *lectio*, *enarratio*, *emendatio*, and *iudicium*.⁸ *Lectio* refers to the proper reading of text, including expression, accent, and punctuation. *Enarratio*, or "explanation," includes the exposition of difficult passages whether a figure

Übersetzungsprinzipien und Quellen der Deuteronomiumübersetzung des Hieronymus (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2016). Jerome discusses his methodology most prominently in his prefaces to the translation of various biblical books and *Epistle* 57. On the letter, see Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus: Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57). Ein Kommentar*, Mnemosyne Supplement 61 (Leiden: Brill, 1980). On Jerome's methodological statements, see above, pp. 46–49 and below, pp. 108–16.

- 4 Rather, Kedar-Kopfstein "Vulgate as a Translation" applies modern (really medieval) grammatical categories of Hebrew such as the *hif'il* and infinitive absolute and considers whether Jerome consistently renders these categories. He does not examine how Jerome might read the Hebrew according to the grammatical categories of his time.
- 5 Michael Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on his Commentary on Jeremiah* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- 6 Extending the work of Lammert, *De Hieronymo*, Graves is the first to explain how this tradition relates to Jerome's understanding of the Hebrew language. His approach also correlates with the general theoretical model articulated by William Frawley, "Prolegomenon to a Theory of Translation," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 250–63. Frawley situates translation theory into the field of semiotics. Translation emerges as a new code through the bilateral consideration of matrix and target codes. Since translation is actually recodification, a theory of translation deals with how, why, when, and where coded elements are rendered into other codes. Thus, translation is a subcategory of semiotic transfer, either copying (verbatim reproduction), transcribing (reducing input into a code), or translating (rendering coded input into another code).
- 7 These categories may not result in consistency, but they do show that Jerome applied a systematic approach to translating.
- 8 Following Graves, I use the Latin terms articulated by Varro which "would have been practiced and taught in the school of Donatus" (Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 20).

of speech, an unusual word, or complex syntax. As the broadest category of ancient grammar, *enarratio* may also involve an interest in the broader structure and longer sections of the work. Since the method of *enarratio* “was to explain the text section by section, clause by clause, and often word by word,” this element of grammar is particularly relevant to the biblical translation.⁹ Utilizing the terminology of Martin Irvine, Graves delineates four subdivisions of *enarratio* that appear in Jerome’s scholarship: grammatical and linguistic clarification, interpretation of *historia*, attention to style and poetic language, and explanation of difficult words (*glossae*) through paraphrase or etymology.¹⁰ Citing Diomedes, Graves astutely notes that *emendatio* refers to more than textual criticism, “the correction of mistakes which happen through writing and speaking.”¹¹ Thus, *emendatio* is not only based on a comparison of manuscripts, it may also be based on suspiciously improper semantic or syntactic usage.¹² The distinction is significant because in the next chapter we examine how Jerome relates to his *Vorlagen*, whereas here he may be correcting the Hebrew itself.¹³ The final category of grammar, *iudicium*, does not play a role in

-
- 9 Ibid., 21. The elements of interpretation under *enarratio* naturally apply to the inherent demands of a translation. For example, J. C. Catford, “Translation Shifts,” in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 141–47 provides a taxonomy for departures or shifts from correspondence between the target language and the source language (141). “Level shifts” refers to grammar and lexis. “Category shifts” refers to sentence equivalence, but the equivalence may not occur on the level of clauses, groups, words, and morphemes. A subcategory, “rank-bound equivalence,” limits equivalence to ranks below the sentence (143). In a “structure shift,” word order varies, while in a “class shift,” a modifier can become a qualifier. In a “unit shift,” a unit is at one rank in the source language and a different rank in the target language (145).
- 10 Graves, *Jerome’s Hebrew Philology*, 22–23. I will be considering *historia* elsewhere (see pp. 83–84, 157–167), because it requires Jerome to move beyond an unmediated relationship between the Hebrew and Latin texts to a variety of external sources and traditions. *Historia* includes the interpretation of historical, geographical, scientific and mythological details.
- 11 *Recorrectio errorum qui per scripturam dictionemve fiunt* (ibid., 23). Jerome often refers to the *errores* of the Septuagint in his prefaces to *iuxta Hebraeos*. See, for example, *Neque enim fieri potest, ut quos plura intermisisse susceperint, non eosdem etiam in quibusdam errasse fateantur, praecipue in Iob, cui si ea quae sub asteriscis addita sunt subtraxeris, pars maxima detruncabitur* (Prol. Job).
- 12 Ibid., 23–24. See also Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 75–78.
- 13 Graves, *Jerome’s Hebrew Philology*, 24 observes that Jerome is unwilling to fault the Hebrew. So *emendatio* may best apply to Jerome’s correction of the *Vetus Latina* on the basis of the Hebrew.

my study because it refers to the assessment of a work and author as a whole. An aesthetic judgment may appear in a commentary, letter, or preface but not in the body of the translation itself.

3.2 Lectio

1. Exod 27:6

MT	וְעִשְׂתָּ בָדִים לְמִזְבֵּחַ בְּדֵי עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים
IH	<i>facies et vetes altaris de lignis setthim duos</i>
LXX	καὶ ποιήσεις τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ φορεῖς ἐκ ξύλων ἀσήπτων

The rendering *duos* ‘two’, unique to IH, demonstrates his understanding and application of *lectio*. Here *lectio* accounts for the difference in number between the Hebrew and Latin, for Jerome reads the regular plural בָּדִים as the dual בְּדֵי.¹⁴ Another possibility is that he reads שִׁטִּים as the homophone-homograph שִׁתִּים ‘two’. In his commentary on Titus 3:9, he not only uses technical grammatical terms associated with the pronunciation of words—*accentus*, *syllabae*, and *aspiratio*—but also notes that pronunciation effects meaning. Mispronounced words elicit laughter from Hebrews who have no idea what he is saying.¹⁵

2. Exod 8:22

MT	וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה לֹא נִכּוֹן לַעֲשׂוֹת בֵּן כִּי תוֹעֵבֶת מִצְרַיִם נִזְבַּח לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הֵן נִזְבַּח אֶת־תוֹעֵבֶת מִצְרַיִם לַעֲיִנְהֶם וְלֹא יִסְקֻלְנוּ
IH (8:26)	<i>et ait Moses non potest ita fieri abominationes enim Aegyptiorum immolabimus Domino Deo nostro quod si mactaverimus ea quae colunt Aegyptii coram eis lapidibus nos obruent</i>
LXX	καὶ εἶπεν Μωυσῆς Οὐ δυνατόν γενέσθαι οὕτως· τὰ γὰρ βδελύγματα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων θύσσωμεν κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν· ἐάν γὰρ θύσσωμεν τὰ βδελύγματα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐναντίον αὐτῶν, λιθοβοληθῶμεθα.

- 14 Contemporary theorists could classify this as a grammatical transformation, addition (Theo A. W. Van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*, CBET 47 [Leuven: Peeters, 2007] 70, 74–75) or contextual manipulation (W. Edward Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*, VTSup 126 [Leiden: Brill, 2008], 85–94).
- 15 Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 27–30 where he discusses instances of Jerome explaining how pronunciation alters the meaning of words.

Exod 18:18

MT	נָבַל תִּבְלֶה גַּם־אֶתָּה גַּם־הָעָם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר עִמָּךְ כִּי־כָבֵד מְמֹךְ הִדְבֵּר לֹא־תִוְכַל עָשֹׂהוּ לְבַדָּךְ
IH	<i>stulto labore consumeris et tu et populus iste qui tecum est ultra vires tuas est negotium solus illud non poteris sustinere</i>
LXX	φθορᾷ καταφθαρῆσῃ ἀνυπομονήτῳ καὶ σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, ὃς ἐστὶν μετὰ σοῦ· βάρυ σοι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, οὐ δυνήσῃ ποιεῖν μόνος.

We will examine *variatio*, also exhibited in these passages, more in depth below in the context of *enarratio*. In these passages, Jerome takes advantage of *lectio* in order to expand the interpretive range of his translation. While *variatio* accounts for the different renderings of נִוְכַח in 8:22, the periphrastic *ea quae colunt* ‘those things which they cherish’ for the second תועבה ‘abomination’ may derive from a sophisticated application of *lectio*. The root ט.ע.ב ‘abominate’ is homophonous with ב.א.ת ‘desire’, much closer in meaning to the Latin *colere*.¹⁶ To be sure, *ea quae colunt* can reasonably be inferred from the context, but the impulse to *variatio* from the target language finds a ready partner in the homophonous root from the source language.¹⁷ A similar explanation may lie behind the rendition of 18:18 with a bit of help from the LXX. For ‘you will exhaust yourself with exhaustion’ the Latin has *stulto labore consumeris* ‘you will be spent by foolish toil’. At first glance, by avoiding the infinitive construct, Jerome typically prefers Latin style to the common Hebrew idiom influenced perhaps by the LXX which also has the adjective-noun construction.¹⁸ In this

16 Jerome was well aware of the difference between *ayin* and *alef*, but he notes that they appear the same in Greek and Latin transliteration; see *ibid.*, 28–29 on Jerome, *Nom. hebr.*; CCSL 72.60. He adds, *unde accidit ut eadem vocabula, quae apud illos non similiter scripta sunt, nobis videantur in interpretatione variari*, thereby indicating his sensitivity to the semantic difference between a word written with an *ayin* and one written with an *alef*. Thus, I believe that in Exod 8:22 Jerome is not making a mistake but exploiting the homophony of the two letters.

17 This transformation can be categorized as combination of of addition, explicitation, and contextual manipulation; see Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 74–75, 81, 86–87 and Glenn, *Finding Meaning*, 85–94. Ernst-August Gutt, “Translation As Interlingual Interpretive Use,” in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 390 astutely notes that if a text is to be experienced aurally, there is greater pressure to depart from the original for extra clarity.

18 LXX, however, has different semantics. On the various ways the Vulgate renders the Hebrew infinitive absolute, see William E. Plater and H. J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926) §26.

instance, however, even if the style of the source language is rejected, the semantics of the source language still play a role. Jerome actually is rendering two possible meanings of the root נבל 'be stupid' and 'languish'. Moreover, it is legitimate to read the unpunctuated Hebrew text as נָבַל 'stupid, foolish' or נָבַל 'drop down, languish'.¹⁹ The *lectio* here maximizes the exegetical possibilities.

3. Exod 3:7–8

MT וְאֶת־צַעֲקָתָם שָׁמַעְתִּי מִפְּנֵי נִגְשָׁיו כִּי יָדַעְתִּי אֶת־מַכָּאֲבֵיו: ח וַיֹּרֵד לְהַצִּילוֹ | מִיָּד
מִצְרַיִם

IH (7) et clamorem eius audiui propter duritiam eorum qui praesunt operibus (8) *et sciens* dolorem eius descendi

LXX (7) καὶ τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐργοδοιωκτῶν· οἶδα γὰρ τὴν ὀδύνην αὐτῶν· (8) καὶ κατέβην ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς Αἰγυπτίων

Proper *lectio* in the Latin grammatical tradition includes the correct division of clauses as ancient texts essentially lacked punctuation. We know that Jerome attended to issues of punctuation because he refers to divisions of clauses in his commentaries, even utilizing the Quintilian term, *distinctio*.²⁰ In Exod 3:7–8, he distinguishes the clauses differently in order to clarify causality. In MT, God hears Israelite cries because God knows their suffering, but in the IH, because God knows their suffering, God descends into Egypt. By reasonably rendering כי ידעתי with the participle *sciens*, he makes possible this different phrasing.²¹ Joining 'because I [God] knew its [the people's] pains' (3:7 in MT and LXX) to 3:8, he produces a clearer relationship between the phrases. For it makes more sense to say *et sciens dolorem eius descendi* (3:8) 'knowing their pain I descended' than to say redundantly that God saw and heard their suffering because God knew their pain. Thus, reading the Hebrew according to a grammatical principle permits a different and more lucid representation of causality.²²

19 "נָבַל," BDB, 614 and "נָבַל," BDB, 615. See also Jerome on Jer 9:21 on the various ways of reading דָּבַר and the semantic implications, as discussed in Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 30. See also Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 81.

20 See Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 20–21, 30–32.

21 Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 72–73 describes this kind of transformation as "change of syntactic function."

22 The fact that these chapter and verse divisions appeared later is not relevant here since Jerome clearly alters the Hebrew by connecting *sciens* to *descendi* rather than *audiui*. Although the Greek eliminates subordination with the γὰρ clause, it still situates "knowing their pain" in causal relationship with "I heard." One could argue that without the *et*, *sciens* could modify *audiui*, but the participle, like the adjective, is close to the noun which

4. Exod 1:9

MT	וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-עַמּוֹ הַזֶּה עַם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל רַב וְעַצוֹם מִמֶּנּוּ
IH	<i>et ait ad populum suum ecce populus filiorum Israhel multus et fortior nobis</i>
LXX	εἶπεν δὲ τῷ ἔθνει αὐτοῦ Ἰδοὺ τὸ γένος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ μέγα πλῆθος καὶ ἰσχύει ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς.
VL	<i>et dixit genti suae. Ecce gens filiorum Israel magna multitudo et valent super nos.</i>

In Exod 1:9, there are two possible *lectiones*. The logic of the Hebrew וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-עַמּוֹ הַזֶּה עַם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל רַב וְעַצוֹם מִמֶּנּוּ ‘And he said to his people, “behold the nation of the Israelites is much and powerful from us” (1:9) suggests that both adjectives should be comparative (i.e., ‘more numerous and more powerful than us’), but it is also possible that only the second adjective should be read comparatively (‘the nation of the Israelites is numerous and it is more powerful than us’). IH adopts the second possibility and renders *multus et fortior nobis*, which does follow the VL (*magna multitudo et valent super nos*) and the LXX (μέγα πλῆθος καὶ ἰσχύει ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς) although both the VL and the LXX express the comparative rather clumsily.²³ This latter reading makes more sense, since it hardly seems possible that there were more Israelites than Egyptians and Israelite military superiority despite smaller numbers is a biblical leitmotif.²⁴

3.3 Enarratio

5. Exod 36:27

MT	וּלְיַרְכְּתִי הַמִּשְׁכָּן יָמָה עָשָׂה שְׁשֵׁה קָרְשִׁים
IH	<i>contra occidentem vero id est ad eam partem tabernaculi quae mare respicit fecit sex tabulas</i>

Graves correctly notes that the interpretation of *glossemata*, difficult or unusual words, is the most common element of *enarratio* in Jerome’s Hebrew

it modifies; see Jules Marouzeau, *L'ordre des Mots en Latin* (Paris: Société D’édition “Les Belles Lettres,” 1953), §34–35.

23 William Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 119 translates “greater and mightier than we,” explicitly rejecting “too great and mighty for us” (see 130 for his explanation). MT allows for both readings. The category for this transformation would be change in word class or syntactic function (van der Louw, *Transformations*, 71–73).

24 See, e.g., Deut 1:27–30.

scholarship.²⁵ This firmly situates him in the Greek and Roman grammatical tradition. Not only did ancient grammarians concentrate on explicating *glossemata*, Roman grammarians such as Servius would resort to a foreign language such as Greek to justify their explanation.²⁶ It may seem superfluous to resort to the Greco-Roman grammatical tradition to explain a natural aspect of translation normally called “explication,”

a transformation whereby elements that are linguistically implicit in the source text are made explicit in the target text; or whereby an SL element, the intended meaning of which is considered unknown or unusual for the target audience, is rendered with a description or paraphrase of its meaning.²⁷

In the case of Exod 36:27, however, we find the technical phrase introducing a gloss. Now the inherent demands of translation to render a difficult Hebrew term into a Latin idiom accounts for *contra occidentem* ‘opposite the west’ as the Latin for ימה ‘seaward’ rather than *ad mare*. Why, however, does Jerome add *id est ad eam partem tabernaculi quae mare respicit* ‘that is, on the side of the Tabernacle that faces the sea’? The paraphrase is found neither in the Hebrew nor in the versions. The paraphrastic form itself, introduced by *id est*, evokes a typical late antique grammatical culture by marking ימה as a *glossema*. Thus, while the content of the translation (seaward = westward = facing toward the sea) is easily deducible from the context (as opposed to the *Vorlagen* or exegetical traditions), the paraphrastic addition introduced by *id est* is driven by the grammatical tradition.

6. Exod 16:15

- MT וַיֵּרְאוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ אֶל־אֶחָיו מִן הוּא כִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ מִה־הוּא וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה
אֲלֵהֶם הוּא ה'לֶחֶם אֲשֶׁר נָתַן יְהוָה לָכֶם לֶאֱכֹלָה
- IH *quod cum vidissent filii Israhel dixerunt ad invicem man hu quod significat quid est hoc ignorabant enim quid esset quibus ait Moses iste est panis quem dedit Dominus vobis ad vescendum.*

Exod 15:23

- MT וַיָּבֹאוּ מִרְתָּה וְלֹא יָכְלוּ לְשַׁתֵּת מַיִם מִמֶּרְה כִּי מֵרִים הֵם עַל־כֵּן קָרָא שְׁמָהּ מֶרְה:

25 Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 35.

26 Ibid., 35–36.

27 van der Louw, *Transformations*, 81.

- IH *et venerunt in Marath nec poterant bibere aquas de Mara eo quod essent amarae unde et congruum loco nomen inposuit vocans illud Mara id est amaritudinem*

Nowhere do we see the grammatical interest in *glossemata* more clearly than in Exod 16:15 and 15:23. Jerome rarely transliterates the Hebrew, much less an entire Hebrew phrase, yet such is the case in 16:15 (*man hu*). By adding *quod significat quid est hoc* ‘which means what is this’ he calls attention to the process of translation. One could argue that he simply explains an untranslated phrase. Nevertheless, such a claim fails to consider that the rendering correlates precisely with the language of grammatical exegesis. In his commentary on Jeremiah on Jer 30:19, he uses the exact same term, *significat: tunc egressa est “laus” sive “gratiarum actio”—hoc enim significat “thoda”*.²⁸ The translation of Exodus here reads like a grammarian’s comment. The expansive rendering of *עַל־כֵּן* in 15:23 as *unde et congruum loco nomen inposuit* ‘whence he coined a name appropriate to the place’ similarly fits grammatical tradition. Servius on *acrem Turnum* in Aeneid 8.614 writes: “*acrem Turnum.*” *nam proprie apud nos acer est qui apud Graecos δεινός dicitur. nam fortem et vehementem, et asperum et amarum.*²⁹ Like Servius (*proprie*), Jerome approves (*congruum*) of the term (*Mara*). The similarities continue because Jerome relies on a foreign language (Latin) to explain the Hebrew term. The name of the place, *Mara*, sounds like the Latin term for “bitter” *amara*, which aptly describes the place of bitter waters. He clearly takes advantage of this coincidence and, in abbreviated fashion, indicates that the name *Marah* is *congruum* because of the correlation between the Hebrew and the Latin.³⁰

7. Exod 18:3–4

- MT וְאֵת שְׁנֵי בָנֶיהָ אֲשֶׁר שָׁם הָאֶחָד גֵּרְשֹׁם כִּי אָמַר גֵּר הָיִיתִי בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם: ד וְשֵׁם הָאֶחָד אֱלִיעֶזֶר כִּי־אָלְהֵי אָבִי בְּעֻזִּי וַיִּצְלַנִּי מִחֶרֶב פְּרַעֲהַ
- IH *et duos filios eius quorum unus vocabatur Gersan dicente patre advena fui in terra aliena 4 alter vero Eliezer Deus enim ait patris mei adiutor meus et eruit me de gladio Pharaonis.*

28 Cited from Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 37.

29 Cited from *ibid.*, 36.

30 A rare term in the Vulgate, only here is *congruus* used in a grammatical sense modifying *nomen*.

In 18:3–4, however, the IH is much less cooperative since Gersan and Eliezer bear no similarity to our translator's native language. This may explain why, like the versions, he does not explicitly indicate the presence of an etymology.³¹ In Exod 15:23 *Mara* is equivalent (*congruum*) to *amaritudo*. In Exod 16:15, however, *man hu* lacks a Latin parallel too, but Jerome adds *significat*. The difference here arises from the fact that *man hu* is a phrase. The Latin reader might miss the pun if he translated rather than transliterated *man hu*. In the case of a manifestly foreign proper name, the reader expects an etymology based on some contextual event, a phenomenon not unheard of in the Latin grammatical tradition. On Aeneid 4.36, Servius writes, *ob quam rem Dido, id est virago, quae virile aliquid fecit, appellata est; nam Elissa proprie dicta est* 'Therefore, she is called Dido, that is, *virago*, who does something manly. For she is properly called *Elissa*.'³² A Latin reader might expect an etiological reason for a foreign name.

Formal grammar is a subcategory of *enarratio*. Although Jerome does not discuss adjectives and adverbs in his other works, he does specifically consider other elements of formal grammar such as number, gender, tense, and syntax.³³ The following examples demonstrate his awareness and application of formal grammar.

3.3.1 Ambiguity

8. Exod 11:7

MT	וְלֹא עָשׂוּ כְּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֱלֹהִים מִלֶּד מִצְרַיִם
IH	<i>non fecerunt juxta praeceptum regis Aegypti</i>
LXX	καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησαν καθότι συνέταξεν αὐταῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου

Not only obscure words but also common words with multiple meanings challenge both the commentator and translator.³⁴ Jerome, like Quintilian, understood that grammarians must indicate the proper interpretation of these ambiguous terms that could be understood in a variety of ways.³⁵ In Exod 11:7,

31 Also, proper names are generally left untranslated (Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 115).

32 *Quae virile aliquid fecit* 'she who does something manly' is synonymous with *virago*, which can be read as *vir(um) ago* 'I play the part of a man'; See "ago," LS 2.D.10.b.

33 Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 45.

34 *Incertum est . . . quae ambiguitas plurimis modis accidit* (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 7.9.2–3).

35 Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 38. Hilary of Poitiers typically acknowledges Hebrew's susceptibility to ambiguity (*ibid.*, 38 n. 87), a point acknowledged by Jerome: *videres quanta silva sit apud Hebraeos ambiguum nominum atque verborum. Quae res diversae interpretationi materiam praebuit* (*Ruf.* 1.20).

he Latinizes the original text by rendering a general Hebrew term with multiple possible meanings more precisely.³⁶ Thus, he translates “as he said” with the more specific *iuxta praeceptum* [*regis Aegypti*] ‘according to the command [of the king of Egypt].’³⁷ While Jerome could be following the sense of the Greek, the idiomatic prepositional phrase (*iuxta praeceptum*) reflects the influence of the target language.

3.3.2 *Variatio*³⁸

Variatio can complicate this understanding of ambiguity in the case of semantics. Ambiguity ultimately derives from properties associated with the source language and must be eliminated by the translator. *Variatio*, however, represents an aesthetic principle of the target language and produces ambiguity by employing homonymous renderings of the same Hebrew word. Elegant Classical stylists employ *variatio* both semantically and syntactically.³⁹ In the case of the Vulgate, however, *variatio* may be more than a question of style. Sometimes Jerome varies the rendition of repeated Hebrew words without affecting the sense. At other times he rejects *variatio*, while sometimes the *variatio* does impact the sense of the text. When these cases of *variatio* point to an exegetical tradition, I will examine them in chapters 5 and 6. Here I will indicate examples of *variatio* simply for stylistic reasons or where the interpretation derives from the context.⁴⁰

9. Exod 1:1

MT	וְאֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַבָּאִים מִצְרָיִם אֶת יַעֲקֹב אִישׁ וּבֵיתוֹ בָּאוּ
IH	<i>haec sunt nomina filiorum Israhel qui ingressi sunt Aegyptum cum Iacob singuli cum domibus suis introierunt</i>
LXX	Ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ τῶν εἰσπεπορευμένων

36 Translation theorists label this “specification” (van der Louw, *Transformations*, 67).

37 Other examples of ambiguous Hebrew that Jerome renders in more specific Latin include: וְיִשִּׁימוּ *praeposuit* (Exod 1:11); יֶלֶד *infantulus* (Exod 2:3); וַיָּבֹאוּ *supervenere* (Exod 2:17); וַתָּבֹאנָה *revertissent* (Exod 2:18); וַתֵּאָמְרוּ *responderunt* (Exod 2:19); וַיַּעֲבֹדֵנִי *ut sacrificet mihi* (Exod 9:1); וְלֹא הָיָה בְרָד *grando non cecidit* (Exod 9:26). In his commentary on Jer 32:2, Jerome explicitly notes concerning א.ב.ב. *verbum enim Hebraicum “bau” ambiguitate sui et “venient” et “ingredientur” sonat*.

38 Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 112–14 also notes this avoidance of repetition found in the Hebrew and rhetorical inclination for variation.

39 Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 68 suggests that *variatio* was also a principle of LXX Amos’ translator.

40 *Variatio* seems to be a form of “anaphoric translation” or “intertextual translation” (Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 82–84) in that the transformation is influenced by the surrounding textual units.

εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἅμα Ἰακωβ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῶν—ἕκαστος
πανοικίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσῆλθοσαν

Exod 3:3–4

- MT וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶסְרֶה-נָּא וְאֶרְאֶה אֶת־הַמַּרְאָה הַזֶּה מְדוּעַ לֹא־יָבֵעַר הַסֵּנֶה: ד
וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה כִּי סָר לְרֵאוֹת וַיִּקְרָא אֵלָיו אֱלֹהִים מִתּוֹךְ הַסֵּנֶה וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר
הַיָּנִי:
- IH *dixit ergo Moses vadam et videbo visionem hanc magnam quare non
conburatur rubus cernens autem Dominus quod pergeret ad videndum
vocavit eum de medio rubi et ait Moses Moses qui respondit adsum*
- LXX εἶπεν δὲ Μωυσῆς Παρελθὼν ὄψομαι τὸ ὄραμα τὸ μέγα
τοῦτο, τί ὅτι οὐ κατακαίεται ὁ βᾶτος.
ὥς δὲ εἶδεν κύριος ὅτι προσάγει ἰδεῖν, ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν
κύριος ἐκ τοῦ βᾶτου λέγων Μωυσῆ, Μωυσῆ. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Τί
ἐστίν;

The varied renderings of א.ו.ב. 'come, enter' in Exod 1:1 as *ingredi* and *introire* negotiates the conflicting demands of *variatio* and ambiguity. We know that Jerome was well aware of the Hebrew's ambiguity because he describes the two possible meanings of א.ו.ב., *venire* and *ingredi*, as examples of *ambiguitas*.⁴¹ Therefore, he properly varies the repetition of the Hebrew root with a synonym for *ingredi* as opposed to a form of *venire*. He may be following the LXX in varying the repeated root, א.ו.ב., as well as the semantics and syntax of the Greek.⁴² Similarly, he varies the rendition of ה.א.ה. 'see' and ר.ו.ס. 'go aside' in Exod 3:3–4 but less closely syntactically and semantically than in the case of Exod 1:1. The first instance of ר.ו.ס. appears as an indicative verb in the Hebrew and Latin and as a participle in the Greek. Unlike the Greek, however, Jerome renders וירא with a participle (*cernens*) and סר with the subjunctive (*pergeret*). Again, the source language, with its fondness for participles and its possession of a subjunctive mood dominates the target language. The participle does not significantly alter the sense of the Hebrew, but the subjunctive has a major impact. If we read *pergeret* as a subjunctive of *ex alia mente*, then we have an

⁴¹ See above, n. 37.

⁴² E.g., in 1:1, both IH and LXX utilize the perfect passive (deponent) participles with the same prepositional prefix (*ingressi*/*εἰσπεπορευμένοι*). MT also varies the syntax (participle/verb) of א.ו.ב., although ה.א.ה. cannot be the exact equivalent of the periphrastic Greek and Latin forms.

example of the Latin resolving a syntactic ambiguity in the Hebrew.⁴³ Namely, the Hebrew makes no distinction between Moses' actual purpose for turning aside and what God assumes to be Moses' reason. The Latin, however, by varying the syntax as well as the semantics, indicates that God speculates that Moses (most likely) proceeded in order to see the vision.

10. Exod 9:25

MT	וַיִּדּוּ הַבָּרָד בְּכָל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אֶת כָּל-אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה מֵאָדָם וְעַד-בְּהֵמָה וְאֵת כָּל-עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה הַהוּא הִכָּה הַבָּרָד וְאֵת-כָּל-עֵץ הַשָּׂדֶה שָׁבַר
IH	<i>et percussit grando in omni terra Aegypti cuncta quae fuerunt in agris ab homine usque ad iumentum cunctam herbam agri percussit grando et omne lignum regionis confregit</i>
LXX	ἐπάταξεν δὲ ἡ χάλαζα ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους, καὶ πᾶσαν βοτάνην τὴν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ ἐπάταξεν ἡ χάλαζα, καὶ πάντα τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις συνέτριψεν ἡ χάλαζα.

In addition to resolving ambiguity, a *variatio* could represent an *emendatio*, not of the Hebrew text, but of the Greek *Vorlagen*.⁴⁴ While the Vulgate often varies more than LXX, in Exod 9:25 the *variatio* corrects a lacuna in LXX. Jerome varies the third שדה 'field' with *regio*, whereas LXX omits the first "field" and does not vary the third one. According to the Syro-Hexapla, the versions all have the first "field," with Aquila rendering *locus*, Symmachus *regio*, and Theodotion *ager*. There is no textual evidence, however, of the third "field" in the Greek. Thus, Jerome restores all three "fields" while simultaneously correcting and drawing on his *Vorlagen*.

11. Exod 13:7

MT	מִצֹּת יֹאכֵל אֶת שִׁבְעַת הַיָּמִים וְלֹא-יֵרָאָה לְךָ חֶמֶץ וְלֹא-יֵרָאָה לְךָ שָׂאֵר בְּכָל-יְבֻלְךָ
IH	<i>azyma comedetis septem diebus non apparebit apud te aliquid fermentatum nec in cunctis finibus tuis</i>
LXX	ἄζυμα ἔδεσθε τὰς ἐπτά ἡμέρας, οὐκ ὀφθήσεται σοι ζυμωτόν, οὐδὲ ἔσται σοι ζύμη ἐν πάσιν τοῖς ὁρίοις σου.

43 Charles E. Bennett, *New Latin Grammar* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1925) §286.1 and Basil Gildersleeve and Gonzalez Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*, 3rd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1895), §525.1N7.

44 See above, n. 13 and below, pp. 89–93, 128–133.

In Exod 13:7 I would even suggest that Jerome alerts his readers that he corrects LXX which ignores the *variatio* present in the Hebrew. Where the Hebrew has three different terms for unleavened and leavened bread (מצות/חמץ/שאר), LXX repeats the root ζυμα (αζυμα/ζυμωτον/ζυμη). This represents a case where the source language has an option (the *alpha*-privative) not available in the Hebrew.⁴⁵ Jerome, however, varies with *azyma* and *fermentatum*. By transliterating the Greek, he calls attention to his Greek *Vorlage*, thereby underscoring his emendation of the Greek by restoring the *variatio* of the Hebrew. He makes an additional nod to the critical reader by rejecting a variation added by LXX. Where LXX renders ולא יראה... ולא יראה as οὐκ ὁφθῆσεται... οὐδέ ἔσται, Jerome simultaneously simplifies the Hebrew and rejects the LXX with the single word *apparebit* for the repeated Hebrew term.

12. Exod 17:11

MT	וְהָיָה כַּאֲשֶׁר יָרִים מֹשֶׁה יָדוֹ וְגִבֹּר יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכַאֲשֶׁר יָנִיחַ יָדוֹ וְגִבֹּר עַמְלֵק:
IH	<i>cumque levaret Moses manus vincebat Israhel sin autem paululum remisisset superabat Amalech</i>
VL	<i>Et factum est cum levabat manus Moyses, praevalebat Israel; ubi autem submiserat manus Moyses, invalescebat Amalech.</i>

Similarly, in Exod 17:11 we encounter a combination of *variatio* and *emendatio*, as Jerome varies the Hebrew, while correcting his source. Unlike the Hebrew and LXX, but similar to VL which varies the preposition, if not the root (*praevalerat/invalescebat*), in 17:11 the Vg has *vincebat/superabat*. Clearly the source language (Latin) determines the semantics since VL *praevalerat* and *invalescebat* awkwardly describe military success. Moreover, Jerome nicely exploits the ambiguity of the Latin *supero*, which combines the sense of winning and surviving. This aptly undercuts the temporary success of the Israelite's archnemesis Amalek.⁴⁶

45 לֵא can function as privative of sorts, but much more rarely than the *alpha*-privative and primarily in poetic contexts. See Gesenius-Kautzsch §1521aN1.

46 Other variations include *sermo... verbum... vox* for קוֹל in Exod 4:8–9; *facere... agere* for עָשָׂה in Exod 7:6; *sanguis... cruor* for דָּם in Exod 7:19; *desertum... solitudo* for מִדְבָּר in Exod 15:22; and *nocere... laedere* for הָיָה in Exod 22:22–23 (MT 22:21–22). Whereas the versions render the repeated root וַיִּחַן 'make camp' (Exod 19:2) only once, Jerome varies with *castramentati sunt... fixit tentoria*.

13. Exod 9:3–7

MT הָנָה יִדְיָהוּהָ הוּיָהּ בְּמִקְנֶה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה בְּסוֹסִים בַּחֲמָרִים בַּגְּמָלִים בַּבָּקָר וּבַצֹּאן דָּבָר
 כָּבֵד מְאֹד: ד וְהִפְלָה יְהוָה בֵּין מִקְנֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבֵין מִקְנֶה מִצְרַיִם וְלֹא יָמוּת מִכָּל־לִבְנֵי
 יִשְׂרָאֵל דָּבָר: ה וַיֵּשֶׁם יְהוָה מוֹעֵד לֵאמֹר מָחָר יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה בָּאָרֶץ: ו וַיַּעַשׂ
 יְהוָה אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה מִמַּחֲרֹת וַיָּמָת כָּל מִקְנֶה מִצְרַיִם וּמִמִּקְנֶה בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא־מָת
 אֶחָד: ז וַיִּשְׁלַח פָּרְעָה וְהָנָה לֹא־מָת מִמִּקְנֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד־אַחַד וַיִּכְבֵּד לֵב פָּרְעָה וְלֹא
 שָׁלַח אֶת־הָעָם:

IH *ecce manus mea erit super agros tuos et super equos et asinos et camelos et boves et oves pestis valde gravis et faciet Dominus mirabile inter possessiones Israhel et possessiones Aegyptiorum ut nihil omnino intereat ex his quae pertinent ad filios Israhel constituitque Dominus tempus dicens cras faciet Dominus verbum istud in terra fecit ergo Dominus verbum hoc altero die mortuaeque sunt omnia animantia Aegyptiorum de animalibus vero filiorum Israhel nihil omnino periit et misit Pharaon ad videndum nec erat quicquam mortuum de his quae possidebat Israhel ingravatumque est cor Pharaonis et non dimisit populum.*

A particularly illuminating example of *variatio* can be found in Exod 9:3–7. For rhetorical effect, Jerome takes advantage of the *ambiguitas* of ק.נ.ה which can refer to possession or creation.⁴⁷ He renders מִקְנֶה ‘cattle, possessions’ with several not necessarily synonymous terms (*agros*, *possessiones*, *animantia*, *animalibus*, *quae possidebat*). In addition to semantic variation, he employs syntactic variation (*possessiones/quae possidebat*). One may wonder why he limits the *variatio* by repeating *possessiones* as well as the cognates *animantia/animalibus*. The reason lies in the context. The same word or cognate highlights the contrast between the suffering Egyptians and the unscathed Israelites.⁴⁸ Thus, Jerome varies the target text in order to achieve rhetorical affect in the source text.

14. Exod 14:19

MT וַיֹּסֶע מֶלֶאכְד הָאֱלֹהִים הַחֲלֹץ לִפְנֵי מַחֲנֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּלְחַד מֵאַחֲרֵיהֶם וַיֹּסֶע עֲמֹד
 הָעֲנָן מִפְּנֵיהֶם וַיַּעֲמֵד מֵאַחֲרֵיהֶם

47 BDB, 1. In Gen 14:19 and Gen 14:22, Jerome renders the root *creare* and *possessor*, respectively.

48 Jerome applies the rhetorical figure of antithesis. While the Greeks used the term ἀντιθέσις, the Latins use *contentio* or *contrapositum*. See Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.81–86.

IH (14:19–20) *tollensque se angelus Dei qui praecedebat castra Israhel abiit post eos et cum eo pariter columna nubis priora dimittens post tergum 20 stetit inter castra. . . .*⁴⁹

LXX ἐξῆρυν δὲ ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ προπορευόμενος τῆς παρεμβολῆς τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἐκ τῶν ὀπισθεν· ἐξῆρυν δὲ καὶ ὁ στῦλος τῆς νεφέλης ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν καὶ ἔστη ἐκ τῶν ὀπίσω αὐτῶν.

In Exod 14:19, Jerome makes explicit an antithesis that is implied in the previous example. The repetition of *γ.ס.נ* in the Hebrew juxtaposes the angel who had been in front of the Israelites with the column of cloud behind them. Jerome further clarifies that both the angel and the cloud move (*tollens se . . . dimittens priora*), and that the cloud moves behind the angel (between the angel and the Egyptians). Rather than repeat *tollens*, Jerome varies with *priora dimittens* and adds *et cum eo pariter* to the Hebrew, with *stetit* as the predicate for *columna*.⁵⁰ Here antithesis should be understood as juxtaposing, not contrasting, the angel and the cloud. Jerome makes it abundantly clear that, with the addition of *pariter*, we have parallelism, not *contentio*.

15. Exod 14:16

MT וַיֹּאמֶר בְּיָלְדָךְ אֶת־הָעֲבָרִיּוֹת וַיֹּאמְרָן עַל־הָאֲבָנִים אֲסֹבֵן הוּא וְהַמָּתָן אֹתוֹ וְאִם־בֵּת הוּא וְחִיָּה

49 And *raising himself* the angel of God who went before the camp of Israel, went behind and *equally with him* the pillar of cloud, *giving up its previous position*, stood behind between the camps.

50 The translation here is more complex than my explanation suggests. *Tollens se* must be a confused reading of the homophone וַיִּשָּׂא. This misreading probably derives from the LXX, which has ἐξῆρυν, an exact rendering of וַיִּשָּׂא. Moreover, there could be a rabbinic tradition behind Jerome's variation. The position of the angel and pillar of the cloud is significant. A tradition of R. Judah preserved in the Mekhilta (Beshalah 4) explains through a parable that the angel and the pillar change positions to protect the Israelites from the Egyptians: ר' יהודה אומר הרי זה מקרא עשיר במקומות הרבה משל למה הדבר דומה לאחד: שהיה מהלך בדרך והיה מנהג את בנו לפניו באו לסטים לשבותו מלפניו נטלו מלפניו ונתנו שהיה מהלך בדרך והיה מנהג את בנו לפניו באו לסטים לשבותו מלפניו נטלו מלפניו ונתנו מן בגלל מצראי דפתקין גירין) Egyptian attacks from Egyptian attacks (מלפניו נטלו מלפניו ונתנו מן בגלל מצראי דפתקין גירין). According to Gen. Rab. 25:5, the verse indicates that the judgment of the fate of the Israelites had hung in the balance, but the movement of the cloud indicates that God redirects the judgment against the Egyptians: ויסע מלאך האלהים ההלך לפני מחנה ישראל וילך מאחריהם (שמות י"ט) מה תלמוד לומר ויסע עמוד הענן מפניהם ויעמד מאחריהם (שם שם שמות י"ד), אלא אותה מידת הדין שהיתה מתוחה כנגד ישראל הפכה הקב"ה ומתחה על המצריים.

- IH *praecipiens eis quando obstetricabitis Hebraeas et partus tempus adven-
erit si masculus fuerit interficite illum si femina reservate*
- LXX καὶ εἶπεν Ὅταν μαιουσθε τὰς Εβραίας καὶ ὧσιν πρὸς τῷ τίκτειν, ἐὰν μὲν
ἄρσεν ᾦ, ἀποκτείνετε αὐτό, ἐὰν δὲ θήλυ, περιποιείσθε αὐτό.

Exod 23:22

- MT אֶת־אֹיְבֵיךָ וְאֶת־אֹיְבֵי־אִיְמֶיךָ וְאֶת־צָרֶיךָ
- IH *inimicus ero inimicis tuis et adfligam adfligentes te*
- LXX ἐχθρεύσω τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου καὶ ἀντικείμενοι τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις σοι.

Even when Jerome occasionally avoids syntactic or semantic *variatio*, his grammatical inclination may be the reason. Like any good grammarian who understands poetics, he may be aware of Hebrew poetic parallelism and seek to preserve it in his translation.⁵¹ In Exod 1:16, for example, he adopts syntactic parallelism: while the Hebrew has an imperative (אַתָּה תִּהְיֶה 'you shall kill [the males]') and jussive (וַיְהִי 'let [the females] live'), both IH (*interficite/reservate*) and LXX (ἀποκτείνετε/περιποιείσθε) have imperative/imperative. Jerome also renders semantic parallels. For example, in Exod 23:22 IH agrees with the Hebrew and versions, employing the cognates in the oblique cases.

3.3.3 Emphasis

16. Exod 10:11

- MT לֹא כֵן לְכוּנָא הַגְּבֵרִים וְעַבְדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה כִּי אֶתָּה אֲתָם מְבַקְשִׁים וַיִּגְרֹשׁ אֹתָם מִאֶת
- IH *non fiet ita sed ite tantum viri et sacrificate Domino hoc enim et ipsi petis-
tis statimque eiecti sunt de conspectu Pharaonis*
- LXX μὴ οὕτως· πορεύεσθωσαν δὲ οἱ ἄνδρες, καὶ λατρεύσατε τῷ θεῷ· τοῦτο γὰρ
αὐτοὶ ζητεῖτε. ἐξέβαλον δὲ αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ προσώπου Φαραῶ.

Although he does not specifically refer to the rhetorical terms *variatio* and *contentio*, Jerome does apply a variety of other technical terms in his exegetical works. This is not surprising because identifying tropes and figures was essential to ancient grammarians and characterizes his approach to Hebrew as well.⁵² Just as he applies tropes to interpreting Scripture in his commentary,

51 Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 50, notes that Jerome refers to Jerusalem and Zion as a word pair, even though he does not use the technical term *parallelus*.

52 Ibid., 47–48.

he also applies them to his translation. For example, in his commentary on Jeremiah, he utilizes the term ἐμφατικῶς to explain how Jer 8:18 must be read with vocal stress.⁵³ While emphasis can be expressed in tone, in Hebrew and Latin such emphasis is also often conveyed by particles and adverbs. In the case of Hebrew, the definite article in הגברים 'the males' can stress both direct address and a whole class while the repeated pronoun (אתם) also indicates emphasis.⁵⁴ Therefore, in Exod 10:11 *tantum* and *ipsi* should be read not as additions to the Hebrew but as correct understandings of Hebrew ἔμφασις rendered in the equivalent Latin idioms. The *statim* 'immediately' in *statimque eiectione sunt* 'they were cast out immediately' logically follows from the context in the Latin—although not in the Hebrew. Jerome reasonably interprets the abrupt change from direct discourse to narrative as indicating that Pharaoh, refusing to discuss the matter any further, immediately expels Aaron and Moses from his presence.

17. Exod 27:8

MT נָבֹב לַחַת תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ כְּאֶשֶׁר הָרָאָה אֶתְּךָ בְּהָרֶ בֵּן יִעָשֶׂה

IH *non solidum sed inane et cavum intrinsecus facies illud sicut tibi in monte monstratum est*

LXX κοῖλον σαναιδωτόν ποιήσεις αὐτό· κατὰ τὸ παραδειχθέν σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει, οὕτως ποιήσεις αὐτό.

Exod 38:7

MT נָבֹב לַחַת עָשָׂה אֹתוֹ

IH *non erat solidum sed cavum ex tabulis et intus vacuum*

As in the case of *ambiguitas* and *variatio*, ἔμφασις can be applied in combination with another grammatical consideration. In Exod 27:8, Jerome renders the unusual Hebrew לַחַת נָבֹב 'hollowed of planks' with the oddly redundant *non solidum sed inane et cavum intrinsecus* (*facies illud [altare]*) '(you will make it [the altar]) not solid, but empty and hollow inside'. Thus, he simultaneously addresses difficult words and identifies and renders emphasis. The passage still raises difficulties. While the semantics can be traced to the Septuagint's κοῖλον σαναιδωτόν, the redundancy is uncharacteristic unless Jerome wished to emphasize the hollowness for some reason. The redundancy appears again in the iterated building of the Tabernacle in Exod 38:7. The Hebrew, interestingly enough, emphasizes the actual construction with the repetition of ה.ש.ע. We

53 Ibid., 34, 152 and Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.2.

54 GKC §§126e, l, 135 a, c.

could speculate that the Latin derives from an exegetical tradition concerning the precise meaning of נבוב לוחות. Alternatively or in addition, since Exod 27:9 begins with ועשית, the Vulgate's lone *facies* (unlike the Hebrew and Greek) could result from haplography. In any case, attention to *glossemata* and ἔμφασις reflects the influence of multiple grammatical categories on the translation.

3.3.4 Grammar/Linguistics

18. Exod 1:1

MT	אִישׁ וּבֵיתוֹ בָּאוּ
IH	<i>singuli cum domibus suis introierunt</i>
LXX	ἕκαστος πανοικίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσῆλθουσιν

Exod 24:1

MT	וְאֶל־מֹשֶׁה אָמַר עֲלֵה אֶל־יְהוָה אֶתָּה וְאַהֲרֹן נָדָב וְאַבִּיהוּא וְשִׁבְעִים מִזְקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם מֵרָחֹק
IH	<i>Mosi quoque dixit ascende ad Dominum tu et Aaron Nadab et Abiu et septuaginta senes ex Israhel et adorabis procul</i>

Exod 24:9

MT	וַיַּעַל מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן נָדָב וְאַבִּיהוּא וְשִׁבְעִים מִזְקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
IH	<i>ascenderuntque Moses et Aaron Nadab et Abiu et septuaginta de senioribus Israhel</i>
LXX	Καὶ ἀνέβη Μωυσῆς καὶ Ααρων καὶ Ναδαβ καὶ Αβιουδ καὶ ἑβδόμηκοντα τῆς γερουσίας Ἰσραηλ

Enarratio also includes exposition of complex syntax. Issues of complex syntax arise in translation because, as translation theorists have long noted, the grammatical registers of the target language and source language are never completely equivalent.⁵⁵ Therefore, inevitably, the translator must decide whether the translation follows the grammatical canons of the target language or the source language. One such case involves idiomatic usages of singular and plural. We know that Jerome was familiar with the morphological difference

55 See Philo, *Mos.* 2.37–38; Jerome, *Epist.* 57.5.2; John Dryden, “On Translation,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 17–31; Henry Schogt, “Semantic Theory and Translation Theory,” in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 193–203; and more recently Eugene Nida, “Principles of Correspondence,” in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000) 126–40.

between the masculine and feminine plural.⁵⁶ More significantly, he was aware that singulars and plurals have unique syntactic properties depending on the language. Thus, for example, he writes that “Israel is said in the singular, but understood as a plural.”⁵⁷ Both Servius and Donatus draw attention to nouns that are singular in form but understood as plurals.⁵⁸ The differences between singular and plural reflect not only Jerome’s close attention to the sense of the Hebrew text but also the dominance of Latin style. For in the instances here and following he captures the *sensus* of the Hebrew while maintaining an elegant Latin style. As one might expect, certain Latin idioms demand a different number than the Hebrew idiom. Thus, in Exod 1:1 **יִשְׂרָאֵל**, which is masculine singular, is rendered *singuli*.⁵⁹ In Exod 24:9, the Vulgate reflects the Latin usage by which a compound subject takes a plural predicate (*ascenderunt*), unless one of the subjects merits particular emphasis. This Latin grammatical conceit accounts for the singular *ascende* in Exod 24:1. Although the verb refers to Aaron, his sons, and the elders, as well as Moses, God explicitly addresses Moses alone (*Mosi . . . dixit*).⁶⁰

19. Exod 1:17

MT	וַתִּירָאֵן הַמִּלֻּדֹת אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים וְלֹא עָשׂוּ כְאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֲלֵיהֶן מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם וַתַּחֲיֶינָן אֶת־הַיָּלָדִים
IH	<i>timuerunt autem obsetrices Deum et non fecerunt iuxta praeceptum regis Aegypti sed conservabant mares</i>
LXX	ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ αἱ μαῖαι τὸν θεὸν καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησαν καθότι συνέταξεν αὐταῖς ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐζωογονοῦν τὰ ἄρσενα.

Exod 21:5

MT	וְאִם־אָמַר יָאֹמַר הָעֶבֶד אֶהְיֶה אֶת־אֲדֹנָי
IH	<i>quod si dixerit servus diligo dominum meum</i>
LXX	ἐὰν δὲ ἀποκριθῇς εἴπῃ ὁ παῖς Ἠγάπηκα τὸν κύριόν μου

56 *Omnia quae in syllabam finuntur IM masculina sint pluralia . . . et quae in OTH feminina pluralia . . .* (Jerome, *Comm. Isa.* 1.2).

57 *Israel singulariter quidem dicitur, sed pluraliter intelligitur* (Jerome, *Comm. Os.* 11:1). See Graves, *Jerome’s Hebrew Philology*, 45–46.

58 Servius on *Aen.* 1.96 and Donatus, *Grammatici latini*, 4.376, cited in Graves, *Jerome’s Hebrew Philology*, 46.

59 See “*singuli*,” LS. In the Greek, singular subject with plural verb is the syntactic equivalent to the Hebrew.

60 On the multiplication of the subject, see Gildersleeve and Lodge, *Gildersleeve’s Latin Grammar*, §285.

Exod 4:15

MT	וְהוֹרִיתִי אֶתְכֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשׂוּן
IH	<i>et ostendam vobis quid agere debeatis</i>
LXX	καὶ συμβιβᾶσω ὑμᾶς ἃ ποιήσετε

In addition to number, the tense systems of Latin and Hebrew differ. It is unclear how much Jerome understood tense and aspect. We do know that he had a concept of tense and contrary-to-fact conditions,⁶¹ which suggests that he understood many of the finer points of the Latin verbal system. Since Latin possesses more tenses than the two of Hebrew (perfective and imperfective), the target language has more options. Therefore, the adoption of a particular Latin tense constitutes an interpretation. The majority of the time, Jerome's choices fit the context. For example, Exod. 1:17 has four Hebrew perfects: דָּבַר, עָשׂוּ, וְהִירָאֻן, and וְתַחֲיֶיךָ. LXX renders the same Hebrew tenses aorist, aorist, aorist, and imperfect, respectively (ἐφοβήθησαν, ἐποίησαν, συνέταξεν, and ἐζωσγόνειτε), and IH similarly renders perfect, perfect, perfect participle, and imperfect (*timuerunt*, *fecerunt*, *praeceptum*, and *conservabant*). The perfect correctly indicates that the midwives were always God-fearing, and the imperfect correctly indicates that they continuously preserved the Hebrew male newborns. In Exod 21:5, Jerome does not follow the Hebrew or the Greek because he renders the perfect אָהַבְתִּי 'I loved' with the present tense *diligo* 'I love'. Nevertheless, since the perfect can have a present sense, and *diligo* is better Latin, the rendition follows from the context.⁶² Exod 4:15 merits comment because he could use the indicative future (like LXX) instead of the subjunctive (*agere debeatis*) which is proper for an indirect question. Again, the rendering follows from the context, since the imperfect Hebrew could be understood as a subjunctive. Here the register of the target language influences the Vulgate's rendition: faced with an imperfect in a relative clause in the Hebrew, Jerome considers (and here chooses) the Latin option of a relative subjunctive clause.

61 *Et quae LXX futura, Hebraicum pro veritate rei iam facta commemorat* (Jerome, *Comm. Jer.* 8:16) and *hic syllogismus et in evangelio textitur, quando impossibile impossibili comparatur* (*Comm. Jer.* 31:37).

62 The present tense is the proper Latin usage for a declaration of love. E.g., "*Amo*" et "*Cupio*" et "*Te solum diligo*" et "*Sine te iam uiuere nequeo*" et cetera, *quis mulieres et alios inducunt et suas testantur adfectiones* (Apuleius, *Metam.* 10.21.10).

3.3.5 *Periphrasis*

20. Exod 1:14

MT	וַיִּמְרְרוּ אֶת־חַיֵּיהֶם
IH	atque <i>ad amaritudinem perducebant vitam eorum</i>
LXX	καὶ <i>κατωδύνων</i> αὐτῶν τὴν ζωήν
VL	et <i>odium eis adducebant</i>

Exod 9:20

MT	הָיִים אֶת־עַבְדָּיו
IH	<i>fecit confugere servos suos</i>
LXX	συνήγαγεν τὰ κτήνη αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς οἴκους·

Exod 5:7

MT	לֹא תִאֲסַפּוּן לָתֵת תְּבֹנָן לָעָם
IH	<i>nequaquam ultra dabitis paleas populo</i>
LXX	Οὐκέτι προστεθήσεται διδόναι ἄχυρον τῷ λαῷ

Exod 40:4

MT	וְהִבֵּאתָ אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן וְעָרַכְתָּ אֶת־עֲרֹכּוֹ
IH	et <i>inlata mensa pones super eam quae rite praecepta sunt</i>
LXX	καὶ εἰσοίσεις τὴν τράπεζαν καὶ προθήσεις τὴν πρόθεσιν αὐτῆς

It should no longer surprise us that Jerome's background in Latin grammar mediates the influence of the source language on his interpretive translations of the Hebrew. Nor should we be surprised that the grammatical inconcinnities between the target language and source language may manifest themselves in different ways. In the previous examples, we considered cases where the Latin had options not available in the Hebrew. These examples present the opposite case: where the Latin lacks semantic and syntactic equivalencies, periphrasis rescues the translator.⁶³ Jerome utilizes periphrasis for four reasons. In Exod 1:14 he renders וַיִּמְרְרוּ with *atque ad amaritudinem perducebant* because the Latin thesaurus lacks a single word. This explains why VL has a periphrasis and LXX does not (κατωδύνων).⁶⁴ Second, not only semantics, but also syntax demands periphrasis. His periphrastic rendering of the causative *hif'il* הָיִים in Exod 9:20 with *fecit confugere* combines Hebrew and Septuagintal

63 These fall under the category of "Addition" (van der Louw, *Transformations*, 74–75).

64 Likewise, cornu petierit for כַּנֹּי in Exod 21:28.

scholarship. The periphrasis reflects awareness of the Hebrew causative form, the *con-* reflects LXX and VL (*congregavit*), while *confugere* is most closely related semantically to σ' διέσωσεν. Third, in the case of Exod 5:7, a Hebrew periphrasis is rendered with a Latin one, *Nequaquam ultra dabitis* for לא תֹאסֶפּוֹן לָתֶת תִּבְנֵי לָעֵם לִלְבָּן הַלְבָּנִים בְּתַמּוּל שְׁלֶשֶׁם הֵם יִלְכוּ וְקִשְׁשׁוּ לָהֶם תִּבְנֵי. Finally, since a single word was readily available (*posita*), the periphrasis of אֶת־תַּעֲרֹכוֹ in Exod 40:4 with *quae rite praecepta sunt* for 'its arrangement' suggests that sometimes Jerome employs this technique as a clarification. He also he may be avoiding the redundancy of the Hebrew.

3.3.6 Historia⁶⁵

21. Exod 5:7

MT לא תֹאסֶפּוֹן לָתֶת תִּבְנֵי לָעֵם לִלְבָּן הַלְבָּנִים בְּתַמּוּל שְׁלֶשֶׁם הֵם יִלְכוּ וְקִשְׁשׁוּ לָהֶם תִּבְנֵי
 IH *nequaquam ultra dabitis paleas populo ad conficiendos lateres sicut prius sed ipsi vadant et colligant stipulam*

In Exod 5:7 we could have a simple example of *variatio*. For the single Hebrew word תִּבְנֵי the Latin has two different terms, *palea* 'chaff' and *stipula* 'stubble'. The distinction matters. By requiring the Israelites to use stubble rather than chaff to fashion bricks, Pharaoh increases their suffering. For it is far more difficult to gather stubble from a field than to exploit the chaff readily available from the grain-processing area. Therefore, here, *variatio* indicates the application of *historia*, a grammatical tool that involves explaining a scientific detail, rather than a rhetorical effect.

This reading of the *variatio*, however, underscores a methodological problem. Does Jerome rely on an interpretive tradition or on the context of the Hebrew itself? To resolve this conundrum, we must weigh the evidence. We can be reasonably certain that he has the Hebrew *Vorlage*. We can also be certain that Pharaoh has increased the workload of the Israelites by altering the method for acquiring grain parts for the bricks. While we have no evidence of an interpretive tradition, we know that such traditions are always a possible source for the Vulgate. Therefore, we must choose between two assumptions: either Jerome has some not-yet-discovered source or the distinction between stubble and chaff was part of his general knowledge. The use of periphrasis provides the solution. If Jerome translates individual Hebrew terms with a Latin periphrasis, perhaps he reads Hebrew collocations periphrastically. That is, he understands each תִּבְנֵי in relation to the corresponding verb. Thus, chaff

⁶⁵ See above p. 30, n.88 and chapter 5, p. 158.

refers to grain which is given, while stubble refers to grain which one gathers. Therefore, I would argue that general knowledge coupled with a close reading of the Hebrew provides a more likely explanation of the *variatio* than an unknown interpretive tradition.

22. Exod 39:6

- MT וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֶת־אֲבָנֵי הַשֹּׁהַם מִסִּבָּת מִשְׁבָּצֶת זָהָב מִפְּתַחַת פְּתוּחֵי חוֹתָם עַל־שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
- IH *paravit et duos lapides onychinos adstrictos et inclusos auro et sculptos arte gemmaria nominibus filiorum Israhel*
- LXX καὶ ἐποίησαν ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς λίθους τῆς σμαράγδου συμπεπορημένους καὶ περισεσιαλωμένους χρυσίῳ, γεγλυμμένους καὶ ἐκκεκολλαμμένους ἐκδόλαμμα σφραγίδος ἐκ τῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ.

Exod 39:14

- MT וְהָאֲבָנִים עַל־שְׁמֹת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל הָנָּה שְׁתֵּים עָשָׂרָה עַל־שְׁמֹתָם פְּתוּחֵי חֹתָם אִישׁ עַל־שְׁמוֹ לְשֵׁנִים עָשָׂר שָׁבֶט
- IH *ipsique lapides duodecim sculpti erant nominibus duodecim tribuum Israhel singuli per nomina singulorum*
- LXX καὶ οἱ λίθοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ δώδεκα ἐκ τῶν ὀνομάτων αὐτῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένα εἰς σφραγίδας, ἕκαστος ἐκ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὀνόματος, εἰς τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς.

The lengthy description of the Tabernacle's construction allows ample opportunity to apply *historia* to explain artistic details. Again, while the interest in *historia* reflects Jerome's late antique context, the content may derive from the Hebrew itself. For example, the variant renderings of בני ישראל as *filii Israhel* in Exod 39:6 and בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל הָנָּה שְׁתֵּים עָשָׂרָה as *(duodecim) tribus Israhel* in Exod 39:14 are significant because they refer to two different entities and they belong to two different contexts. The “sons of Israel” are engraved into the gems of the *superumerale* while the “tribes of Israel” appear on the *rationale*. Nevertheless, Jerome clarifies the beginning of Exod 39:14 by drawing on the explicit mention of the twelve tribes at the end of the verse.

3.3.7 Figures/Metaphor

23. Exod 13:17

- MT פְּנִינָהֶם הָעַם בְּרָאֲתָם מִלְחָמָה וְשָׁבוּ מִצְרֵימָה
- IH *ne forte paeniteret eum si vidisset adversum se bella consurgere et reverteretur in Aegyptum*

According to Jerome, the plain meaning of Scripture may be a metaphor. In his commentary on Hab 3:14, he expresses this idea in the terminology of Latin grammarians: *quia frequenter historia ipsa metaphorice textitur* (Jerome, *Comm. Habac.* 3:14).⁶⁶ The grammarian's attention to a combination of *historia* and rhetorical tropes explains why he expands the personification of war in Exod 13:17. With his addition of *adversum se . . . consurgere* to 'seeing war' (בראתם מלחמה) he produces a far more dramatic conceit of war rising forth ("if they saw that war *was rising against them*"). I am claiming here that Jerome identifies and extends a trope already present in the Hebrew rather than transforming unpoetic Hebrew into a metaphorical Latin rendition. Jerome could be using poetic language here simply for rhetorical effect, but the expanded metaphor suggests an intertextual dialogue as well. His semantic choice recalls the shield of Aeneas: *subitoque nouum consurgere bellum* Romulidis Tatíoque seni Curibusque seueris (Aen. 8.637–8). Moreover, the contexts of Exod 13:17 and *Aeneid* 8.637–8 are similar, since both passages prophetically describe future conflicts. The passage from the *Aeneid* refers to the first war after Rome was founded, while the passage from Exodus alludes to the early wars about to be faced by the Israelites.⁶⁷ Servius' interpretation of the line correlates as well. His reading appears in a discussion of line 3.591:

NOVA FORMA VIRI bene formam viri dixit, non hominem. et est periphrasis pro "ignotus vir." "nova" autem fugienda: aliter alibi "quis novus hic nostris," id est insperatus: item "subitoque novum consurgere bellum," id est detestandum: item "vere novo," id est incipiente: item "duo lacte novo," id est recenti: item "comitum adfluxisse novorum," hoc est ignotorum.

Servius bases the various connotations of *novus* 'new' on the context. In the passage from 8.637 (*subitoque novum consurgere bellum*), he ignores *subitoque* 'suddenly', for otherwise *novus* would connote *insperatus* 'unexpected'.

66 Angelo Penna, *Principi e crattere dell'esegesi di San Gerolamo*, SPIB 102 (Rome: Pontificio istituto biblico, 1950), 74.

67 *Consurgere . . . ad bellum* appears in Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 10.13.4 and 33.19.7. A poetic provenance is more likely since *consurgere bellum* also appears in Paris' speech to Helen in Ovid, *Her.* 16.353. *Bella surgentia* appears in Aen. 4.43 when Anna is encouraging Dido to join with Aeneas. Similar to the sense in Exodus, imminent wars have persuasive force through fear (*ex timore*, according to Servius, on Aen. 4.43) The phrase *bellum in media pace consurgit* does appear in Seneca, *Ep.* 91.5.5, where the context remains the same despite the prose form: Seneca describes sudden reversals.

Therefore, according to Servius' reading of the context, *novum consurgere bellum* refers to an accursed war. Such a war would goad the Israelites to return to Egypt. Thus, 1H could be reflecting not only Vergilian phrasing but also the late antique reading of this passage.

24. Exod 14:27

MT	וַיַּנְעִר יְהוָה אֶת־מִצְרַיִם בְּתוֹךְ הַיָּם
1H	<i>involvit eos Dominus in mediis fluctibus</i>

The rendering of the singular Hebrew in the prepositional phrase בתוך הים with the Latin plural plus adjective construction represents more than a syntactic change subordinating the Hebrew to the Latin idiom. Jerome employs the poetic trope of synecdoche by referring to the sea as waves.⁶⁸ He poeticizes the translation further by reference to a Vergilian intertext. The phrase *mediis fluctibus* appears in *Aeneid* 1.109, *saxa vocant Itali mediis quae in fluctibus aras*. The use of *involvit* further suggests the conflation of *Aeneid* 1.109 with *Aeneid* 6.336 (*obruit Auster, aqua inuoluens nauemque uirosque*) since the sections from Vergil as well as Exodus all refer to drownings at sea.⁶⁹

25. Exod 25:10

MT	וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֲרוֹן עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים אֲמָתַיִם וַחֲצֵי אַרְבּוֹ וְאֲמָה וַחֲצֵי רֶחֱבּוֹ וְאֲמָה וַחֲצֵי קָמָתוֹ
1H	<i>arcam de lignis setthim conpingite cuius longitudo habeat duos semis cubitos latitudo cubitum et dimidium altitudo cubitum similiter ac semissem</i>
LXX	Καὶ ποιήσεις κιβωτὸν μαρτυρίου ἐκ ξύλων ἀσήπτων, δύοπλήγεων καὶ ἡμίσεως τὸ μήκος καὶ πήχεος καὶ ἡμίσεως τὸ πλάτος καὶ πήχεος καὶ ἡμίσεως τὸ ὕψος.

According to Graves, Jerome demonstrates awareness of Hebrew poetics, particularly in the case of assonance and wordplay.⁷⁰ This may explain why the Latin for Exod 25:10 demonstrates features of assonance and consonance. The verse includes the parallel sounds *latitudo/altitudo* and *cubitum/cubitum* as well as the consonance of *m*. Jerome may be responding to the sounds of the

68 Jerome himself defines synecdoche (the part representing the whole): *hoc schema graece dicitur συνεκδοχή, quod dicunt grammaticae ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πᾶν* (*Tract. Ps.* 109:3). See Penna, *Principi e crattere*, 78 and Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 49.

69 *Mediis fluctibus* is quite common in poetry, e.g., *fluctibus in mediis questu uoluebat inani* (*Appendix Vergiliana, Ciris*, 402); Horace, *Ep.* 2.2.89; Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 5.672; and Ovid, *Tristia* 5.6.9.

70 Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 50. See Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 81.

Hebrew. Although not a poetic passage per se, the Hebrew contains the consonance of עָצִי and חָצִי as well as the assonance of קָמְתוּ/רָחְבוּ/אָרְבוּ. This attention to euphony may explain additions to the Vorlage. He adds *variatio* to the Hebrew, rendering חָצִי with *dimidium* and *semissem*. This *variatio* is peculiar because Jerome explicitly (*similiter*) calls attention to the identical height and width of the altar. Why would he use *semissem* and then add *similiter ac* to the Hebrew rather than simply use *dimidium* again? A *Vorlage* that differs from MT may provide the explanation for *semissem*, but not *similiter ac*. Regardless of whether he follows or varies from his *Vorlage*, the text clearly marks an interpretive move. The explicit emphasis of the similar measurements is further reinforced by the parallel in sound present in the Hebrew and rendered in the Latin.

26. Exod 3:5

- MT וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה קֵרְבָה הֵלֶם שְׁלֵגְעָלֶיךָ מֵעַל רַגְלֶיךָ כִּי הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אָתָּה עֹמֵד עָלָיו אֲדַמְתִּיקָדָשׁ הוּא
- IH *at ille ne adpropies inquit huc solve calciamentum de pedibus tuis locus enim in quo stas terra sancta est*
- LXX καὶ εἶπεν Μὴ ἐγγίσῃς ὧδε· λῦσαι τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν σου· ὁ γὰρ τόπος, ἐν ᾧ σὺ ἕστηκας, γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν.

Exod 9:2

- MT כִּי אִם־מֵאֵן אָתָּה לְשַׁלַּח וְעוֹדֶיךָ מְחַזֵּק בָּם
- IH *quod si adhuc rennuis et retines eos*
- LXX εἰ μὲν οὖν μὴ βούλει ἐξαποστεῖλαι τὸν λαόν μου, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἐγκρατεῖς αὐτοῦ.

Since Jerome also applies the rhetorical figure hyperbaton in his commentaries, his grammatical background influences his sensitivity to word order.⁷¹ He generally follows the Hebrew word order, but occasionally the order is different, despite his claim in *Epistle* 57.5.2 that the order of the words in Scripture is a mystery.⁷² It would be tedious to list the innumerable departures from the word order because most of them are insignificant. There are, however, striking rearrangements in Exod 3:5 and Exod 9:2. In 3:5, instead of introducing God's commands to Moses with "and He said," Jerome inserts *inquit* between "do not approach" and "remove your shoes here." The reason derives from the target

71 E.g., *vero lectionis ordo confusus est et hyperbato perturbatur* (Jerome, *Comm. Gal.* 3.19–20).

72 Bartelink, *Hieronymus*, 45–46.

language, for Latin commonly introduces a verbal response with *at ille*.⁷³ Thus, Jerome's elegant Latin style appropriately highlights the dramatic encounter between God and Moses.⁷⁴ In Exod 9:2, he places *adhuc* before *rennuis* not *retines* as in the MT and LXX thereby modifying both verbs. Here, he clarifies what logically follows from the context, namely the idea of Pharaoh still refusing to release as well as still retaining the Israelites.

27. Exod 12: 12–13, 21, 23, 26–27

- MT וְעִבְרָתִי בְּאֶרֶץ-מִצְרַיִם... יג... וּפְסָחֹתִי עֲלֵכֶם... כא וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה לְכָל-זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם מִשְׁכוּ וּקְחוּ לָכֶם צֹאן לְמִשְׁפַּחְתֵּיכֶם וּשְׁחֻטוּ הַפֶּסַח... כג וְעִבֵּר יְהוָה
לִנְגֹף אֶת-מִצְרַיִם... כו וְהָיָה כִּי-יֵאמְרוּ אֲלֵיכֶם בְּנֵיכֶם מַה הָעִבְדָּה הַזֹּאת לָכֶם: כז
וְאָמַרְתֶּם זִבְח־פֶּסַח הוּא לַיהוָה אֲשֶׁר פָּסַח עַל-בְּתֵי בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמִצְרַיִם בְּנִגְפוֹ אֶת-
מִצְרַיִם וְאֶת-בְּתֵינֵנוּ הִצִּיל וַיִּקְדֹּ הָעָם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ
IH *et transibo per terram Aegypti... (13)... ac transibo vos... (21) vocavit
autem Moses omnes seniores filiorum Israhel et dixit ad eos ite tollen-
tes animal per familias vestras immolate phase... (23) transibit enim
Dominus percutiens Aegyptios... (26) et cum dixerint vobis filii vestri
quae est ista religio (27) dicetis eis victima transitus Domini est quando
transiuit super domos filiorum Israhel in Aegypto percutiens Aegyptios et
domos nostras liberans incurvatusque populus adoravit.*

Graves suggests that Jerome's grammatical education influenced his attention to Hebrew wordplay.⁷⁵ One of the most famous puns in Scripture appears in Exodus 12, the play on פסח. He highlights the pun by repeating *transire*, culminating in the rendition *transitus* for 12:27. He further underscores the pun by rendering פסח and עבר as variants of *transire*. Why then does he preserve *phase* in 12:21? He waits to explain the pun. The repetition of *transire* establishes the term as a *Leitwort*. Jerome, however, does not want to reveal the pun until 12:27 in order to respond to the question in 12:26. Part of explaining the *religio* includes appreciation of the wordplay. Lest the reader miss the equivalence

73 E.g., Horace., *Sermones*, 1.9.6–7.

74 Jerome could also be applying ἔμφασις, because *inquam* adds stress to the word after which it appears. See "*inquam*," LS, 1.B.

75 Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 50. The absence of a common grammatical term makes the argument circumstantial. Jerome recognizes Hebrew puns and that wordplay is common to Latin literature. Nevertheless, since he does apply the grammatical category of *ambiguitas* (see above, pp. 70–71), it is reasonable to postulate that he exploits homonyms in the Latin as well as recognizes wordplay in the Hebrew.

of *transitus* and *phase*, he identifies *phase* as the *religio* a little bit later in the chapter.⁷⁶ In a sense, just as the parent translates the festival to the children, Jerome translates the festival for his readers.

3.4 Emendatio

28. Exod 8:14

MT (8:10) חֲמֹרִים חֲמֹרִים ‘heaps [upon] heaps’

LXX θημονιάς θημονιάς

α’ κόρους κόρους θ’ σωρούς σωρούς

VL *acervos acervos*

IH *immensos acervos*

Exod 10:19

MT רִיחַ חָזָק מֵאֵד

LXX ἀνεμὸν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης σφοδρόν

IH *ventum ab occidente vehementissimum*

Exod 16:4

MT וְלָקְטוּ דְּבַר־יְיֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ

LXX συλλέξουσιν τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν

VL *colliget unius diei in diem*

IH *colligat quae sufficiunt per singulos dies*

Emendatio refers to correcting the language in addition to textual criticism. Therefore, an emendation can semantically and/or syntactically alter the source text. By definition, however, *emendatio* relies on textual traditions and the linguistic system, not on a tradition of interpretation. In the next chapter, we examine Jerome’s textual criticism in relationship to Greek biblical tradition. Here, we consider correction of usage which depends on the direct (or indirect) encounter between the Hebrew and Latin linguistic systems. According to Graves, Jerome never corrects Hebrew usage and rarely criticizes Greek usage in LXX, although he does emend the text of LXX and VL according to MT.⁷⁷ I would suggest, however, that he does correct Hebrew usage as

⁷⁶ *Haec est religio phase* (Exod 12:43).

⁷⁷ Graves, *Jerome’s Hebrew Philology*, 23–24, 53–61.

mediated through his *Vorlagen*. Thus, in Exod 8:14, Jerome renders the repeated accusative which indicates emphasis in Hebrew with the adjective-noun combination (*immensos acervos*) that is normative in Latin.⁷⁸ Seen in relationship with the Greek tradition, his translation in fact corrects the Hebrew. Since the Greek versions and VL accurately render the MT verbatim, IH could be understood as correction of the style not the text. Similarly, in Exod 10:19, he latinizes the Hebrew intensive with the common Latin construction (*vehementissimum*) and paraphrases the Hebrew in 16:4 (“a thing of a day on its day”) with a far more idiomatic expression (*quae sufficiunt per singulas dies*). A comparison with the Greek and VL versions of these two passages, which translate MT literally, demonstrates how Jerome emends the Hebrew usage. Thus, one could claim that he corrects Hebraisms, not the Hebrew. What I am trying to show is how Latin so significantly different from the Hebrew may, nonetheless, be explained through the Hebrew, not some external interpretive tradition. This accounts for the striking syntactic difference between the Latin and Hebrew without any significant semantic difference.

29. Exod 6:26

MT	הוֹצִיאוּ אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם עַל־צְבָאוֹתָם
IH	<i>ut educerent filios Israhel de terra Aegypti per turmas suas</i>
LXX	ἐξαγαγεῖν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σὺν δυνάμει αὐτῶν.

In addition to the syntax, Jerome can emend the semantics of the Hebrew. In Exod 6:26, unlike the LXX σὺν δυνάμει αὐτῶν, he renders עַל־צְבָאוֹתָם ‘on their hosts’ as *per turmas suas* ‘by their troops’, which has the more specifically military connotation suggested by the Hebrew.⁷⁹ In Exod 7:4, he translates the same word with *exercitum* ‘army’. The plural of Exod 6:26 creates the problem that requires emendation. It does not make sense to describe the Israelites as consisting of multiple armies. The smaller unit, *turmae*, fits the context better. Such a correction is obvious from the context, therefore, and we do not need to posit an interpretive tradition.

78 See GKC, §123e. Sometimes Jerome preserves the Hebraism and renders the repetition into Latin (Plater and White, *Grammar*, §31). For מַעַט מַעַט, he renders *paulatim atque per partes* in Deut 7:22, but has only *paulatim* in Exod 23:30. Both cases similarly refer to the gradual expulsion of the nations from the land of Israel.

79 In general, *turma* refers to a band of soldiers and more specifically to a tenth of the cavalry wing. See “*turma*,” LS.

30. Exod 2:5

MT ותשלח את-אמיתה

IH misit unam e famulis suis.

We see a similar semantic correction of the Hebrew in Exod 2:5. Jerome clarifies אמיתה 'her maid servant' with *unam e famulis* 'one of her maid servants' (unlike LXX τὴν ἄβραν) thereby demonstrating an interest in preserving the logic of the situation (and the dignity of Pharaoh's daughter). Pharaoh's daughter has come to the river with many servants; therefore, it would be impossible that she had only one servant. Yet this would be the implication of "she sent her servant".

31. Exod. 23:2

MT ולא-תענה על-רב לנזת אחר רבים להטות

IH *nec in iudicio plurimorum adquiesces sententiae ut a vero devies*

LXX οὐκ ἔσῃ μετὰ πλείονων ἐπὶ κακίᾳ. οὐ προστεθήσῃ μετὰ πλήθους ἐκακλῖναι μετὰ πλείονων ὥστε ἐκακλῖναι κρίσιν

Exod 26:5

MT ותעשה בקצה היריעה אשר במקברת השנית מקבילת הללא אשה אל-חחיתה

IH *ita insertas ut ansa contra ansam veniat et altera alteri possit aptari.*

LXX ποιήσεις ἐκ τοῦ μέρους τῆς αὐλαίας κατὰ τὴν συμβολὴν τῆς δευτέρας· ἀντιπρόσωποι ἀντιπίπτουσαι ἀλλήλαις εἰς ἐκάστην.

Exod 26:12

MT וסרוך העדף ביריעת האהל הצי היריעה העדפתת סרוך על אחרי המשכן

IH *quod autem superfuerit in sagis quae parantur tecto id est unum sagum quod amplius est ex medietate eius operies posteriora tabernaculi.*

LXX καὶ ὑποθήσεις τὸ πλεονάζον ἐν ταῖς δέρρεσιν τῆς σκηנῆς. τὸ ἥμισυ τῆς δέρρεως τὸ ὑπολειμμένον ὑποκαλύψεις, τὸ πλεονάζον τῶν δέρρεων τῆς σκηנῆς ὑποκαλύψεις ὁπίσω τῆς σκηנῆς.

Emending the sense of the Hebrew in order to preserve the logic of the text emerges especially in the legal texts and Tabernacle texts. For the former, Jerome seeks to highlight what he perceives to be the central legal issues while, in the case of the Tabernacle, he presents the construction as technically correct. Thus, in Exod 23:2, he understands the opaque prescription *וְלֹא-תַעֲנֶה עַל-רַב לְנֹזֵת אַחֲרֵי רַבִּים לְהַטּוֹת* 'you shall not be oppressive in judgment inclining after the many to cause inclining' more clearly as *ut de vero devies* 'so that you

do not go astray from the truth'. In the case of the Tabernacle, the interest in technical accuracy appears in the rendering of Hebrew idioms and in the addition of glosses. For example, Jerome corrects the Hebrew idiom *מִקְבִּילֹת הַלֵּלָאֵת אֶל־אֶחָתָהּ* 'the loops will correspond, wife to sister' with *altera alteri* 'one to another' (26:5). In 26:12, a gloss (*id est*) clarifies that the remaining part of the curtains refers to one extra long curtain.⁸⁰

32. Exod 4:2

MT מִזֶּה [מִהֲזֶה] בְּיָדְךָ וַיֹּאמֶר מֶטֶה

IH *quid est hoc quod tenes in manu tua respondit virga*

In Exod 4:2, since the answer to the question is "staff," it logically follows that the full query should include *quod tenes*, although the Hebrew lacks this phrase. Latin grammar drives this emendation of the sense, because a *quod* clause regularly follows *quid est hoc*.⁸¹ The resulting Latin does produce a more precise question.

33. Exod 6:27

MT הֵם הַמְדַּבְּרִים אֶל־פֶּרְעָה מֶלֶךְ־מִצְרַיִם לְהוֹצִיא אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרַיִם הוּא מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן

IH *hii sunt qui loquuntur ad Pharaon regem Aegypti ut educant filios Israhel de Aegyptio iste Moses et Aaron*

LXX οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ διαλεγόμενοι πρὸς Φαραὼ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐξήγαγον τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου· αὐτὸς Ααρων καὶ Μωσῆς.

Exod 7:4

MT וְלֹא־יִשְׁמַע אֲלֵכֶם פֶּרְעָה וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־יָדִי בְּמִצְרַיִם וְהוֹצֵאתִי אֶת־צְבָאוֹתַי אֶת־עַמִּי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בְּשַׁפְטִים גְּדֹלִים

80 It should be noted, however, that Jerome considers glosses an element of biblical style. E.g., although the clarification *collegerunt cibos duplices id est duo gomor* logically follows from the Hebrew *שָׁנִי הָעֶמֶר לָחֶם מִשְׁנָה* 'double bread, two omers' (16:22), the addition of *id est* indicates that he understood the latter phrase as a gloss, that glosses were part of the Bible's rhetorical repertoire. See also Exod 29:5. This phenomenon should be distinguished from the *glossemata* that require explanation by the grammarian (see pp. 67–70). In the examples cited here, the Hebrew terms are not difficult, but the sense of the passage as a whole is somewhat garbled. In addition, Jerome does not explain a difficult word but may suggest that the Bible is explaining the difficult word. Therefore, *id est* represents a clarifying emendation of the literal sense of the text.

81 Gildersleeve and Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*, §525.1N2.

- IH *et non audiet vos inmittamque manum meam super Aegyptum et educam exercitum et populum meum filios Israhel de terra Aegypti per iudicia maxima*
- LXX καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσεται ὑμῶν Φαραώ· καὶ ἐπιβαλὼ τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἐξάξω σὺν δυνάμει μου τὸν λαόν μου τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σὺν ἐκδικήσει *μεγάλη*

Since Hebrew and Latin do not always correspond syntactically, Jerome's rendition of Exodus includes several cases in which the difference in syntax produces a slight difference in interpretation. Here I consider two instances where the interpretive differences do not appear to be significant but do reveal the dominance of the target language. These examples reflect *emendatio*, because the system of the target language corrects the system of the source language. For instance, in Exod 6:27 we find one of the many cases in which he renders the Hebrew infinitive as a purpose clause in Latin. This requires the Latin to specify the subject of לְהוֹצִיאַ and correct the Hebrew idiom. For the infinitive with בָּרַבֵּר means 'to promise to do something'.⁸² According to IH, however, Moses and Aaron do not say (i.e., promise) that they will lead the Israelites but speak to Pharaoh in order to lead forth the Israelites.⁸³ The act of speech itself contributes to the release of the Israelites. Even if the Latin interprets the Hebrew differently than its literal meaning, this rendering can easily be derived from the Hebrew and the biblical context. After all, God sends Moses and Aaron to request that Pharaoh release the Israelites. Similarly, although it fits the context, the superlative *maxima* for גְּדֹלִים in Exod 7:4 does not follow the Hebrew exactly. These cases, especially in comparison to LXX, demonstrate a preference for the syntax of the target language.

3.4.1 *Clause Connectors*

Much criticism has been laid against the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis that language determines thought. Some scholars have recently advocated a qualified version of the theory, namely that discourse unique to a culture influences categories

82 "דבר," BDB, 181. Jerome may understand the Hebrew idiom because he renders אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּרֶת לַעֲשׂוֹת in Deut 1:14 as *quam vis facere*.

83 It is possible that the Latin construction represents a postclassical tendency in the Vulgate to utilize *ut* with subjunctive after verbs of promising and threatening, after *dicere* for the imperative, or with verbs of dependent desire (Plater and White, *Grammar*, §§134, 137). Even if Jerome reads the Hebrew as a promise, he still emends the infinitive construction into an *ut* clause.

of thinking.⁸⁴ Such a notion explains one of the most significant differences between biblical and Latin discourse. Biblical Hebrew trends more toward parataxis than hypotaxis, with most clauses joined with the simple copula ו 'and'.⁸⁵ There are three possible ways to render the paratactic style of the Hebrew in Latin. The first would be *verbum ad verbum* with a repetition of the copulative *et*. The second approach renders each copulative with a coordinating or subordinating conjunction that explains the relationship between the various clauses being connected. The third approach subordinates the clauses with participles rather than realizing the copula. Although utilizing a conjunction other than *et* reflects an interpretive judgment about how clauses relate to each other, it is generally not necessary to posit an external tradition to account for a rendition that fits the internal logic of the passage. The third approach, the participial clause, interestingly enough, represents the most radical syntactic departure from Hebrew usage but is semantically closer to the Hebrew. While Hebrew has a participle and a relative pronoun, their prominent use is much more characteristic of Greek and Latin (not to mention the fact that Greek and Latin have many types of participles and relative pronouns). Just as in Hebrew, the precise meaning of the participle in relation to the main verb is not explicit but must be determined from the context. As for the subordinate clause in the second approach, it should be noted that the Latin has two modal options, indicative or subjunctive, unlike the Hebrew.⁸⁶ While all the Greek and Latin translations adopt all three approaches, the abundance of various clause connectors and participles in Jerome's version distinguishes his style from the others.⁸⁷ Although LXX renders the paratactic style of MT with δέ as well as καί, it rarely draws on the variety of Greek participles. VL goes slightly further than LXX in this respect, but neither LXX nor VL contain as many

84 See above, p. 59, n. 49.

85 Whether the *waw* is added to a perfect or imperfect form of the verb or whether it represents a different morphological category is a matter of debate among modern grammarians; see James D. Martin, ed. and rev., *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar*, 27th ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993) 85–87; Jo Ann Hackett, *A Basic Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 89–91, 98; and the detailed discussion in Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 455–78. LXX and Jerome, however, understood the *waw* to be copulative; see F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek*, repr. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988) §§38–40 and Plater and White, *Grammar*, §132.

86 Hebrew has one tense, the imperfect, for both indicative and subjunctive usages (GKC §§107–109). Thus, the translator must decide to translate a Hebrew verb as a subjunctive.

87 Kedar-Kopfstein, "Vulgate as a Translation," 259–70 as well as the examples below.

different conjunctive and subordinating clause connectors as IH. These clause connectors are the most distinctive characteristics of Jerome's translation.

What accounts for his remarkable resistance to parataxis, even in comparison with the Greek traditions? The register of the Latin language not only allows for clausal subordination but prefers it. Jerome, schooled in the periodic style of Cicero, could not completely reject Latin eloquence. As the variety of subordinating strategies will show, however, connecting clauses do not simply reflect stylistic proclivities. The Latin language prefers understanding and specifying the relationship between discrete phrases. The language system drives the Latin translator to detect and articulate contrast, purpose, result, cause, and relative time.

3.4.2 *Particles*

In the following examples, Jerome maintains the parataxis to some extent by preserving the independent clauses. Nevertheless, the connecting particles clarify the relationship between these clauses in the Latin far more than in the Hebrew. All these coordinating connectors logically follow from the context, but some are correlative (*itaque*, *ergo*, *igitur*, *quam ob rem*, and *quoque*) while others are contrastive (*autem* and *sed*). Also, unless otherwise noted, these are all renderings of the Hebrew ו. *itaque*: *Venite sapienter opprimamus eum*... *Praeposuit itaque* (Exod 1:10–11); *ergo*: *dixit ergo Moses vadam et videbo visionem* (Exod 3:3), *bene ergo fecit* (Exod 1:20),⁸⁸ *dixit ergo* (Exod 4:2), *sitivit ergo* (Exod 17:3), *venit ergo Moses et narravit plebi* (Exod 24:3); *igitur*: *igitur egressi* (Exod 5:10); *quam ob rem*: *quam ob rem festinus Pharaon vocavit Mosen*... (Exod 10:16); *quoque*: *virgam quoque* [וַאֲזָרָתָא] *hanc sume* (Exod 4:17), *dixit quoque Dominus ad Mosen et Aaron* (Exod 12:1); *autem*: *dixit autem rex Aegypti obstetricibus Hebraeorum* (Exod 1:15), *timuerunt autem obsecrices Deum* (Exod 1:17), *cernens autem Dominus quod pergeret ad videndum* (Exod 3:4; VL also has *autem*), *qui autem neglexit* (Exod 9:21), *vocavit autem Moses omnes seniores* (Exod 12:21); and *sed*: *sed veni, mittam*... (Exod 3:10).

Sometimes Jerome renders the parataxis with a subordinating conjunction. For example, in Exod 2:3, וְלֹא־יָכֹלָה עֹד הִצְפִּינוּ 'and she was not able to hide him any longer' LXX has ἐπει... and IH has *cumque jam celare non posset*; both provide a logical clarification. Also וְאִם־אָמַר יַאֲמַר הָעֶבֶד *quod si dixerit servus* (Exod 21:5) logically follows from the context.

Even when clause connectors fit the context, they sometimes reflect deeper interpretations. Exod 6:15–25 particularly raises the question of why Jerome is not consistent in his renderings of the copulative:

88 This logically follows from the context and exactly renders the Septuagint's δέ.

hae cognationes Ruben filii Symeon Iamuhel *et* Iamin *et* Aod Iachin *et* Soer *et* Saul filius Chananitidis hae progenies Symeon 16 *et* haec nomina filiorum Levi per cognationes suas Gerson *et* Caath *et* Merari anni autem vitae Levi fuerunt centum triginta septem 17 filii Gerson Lobeni *et* Semei per cognationes suas 18 filii Caath Amram *et* Isuar *et* Hebron *et* Ozihel annique vitae Caath centum triginta tres 19 filii Merari Mooli *et* Musi hae cognationes Levi per familias suas 20 accepit *autem* Amram uxorem Iocabed patruelem suam *quae* peperit ei Aaron *et* Mosen fueruntque anni vitae Amram centum triginta septem 21 filii *quoque* Isuar Core *et* Napheg *et* Zechri 22 filii *quoque* Ozihel Misahel *et* Elsaphan *et* Sethri 23 accepit *autem* Aaron uxorem Elisabe filiam Aminadab sororem Naasson *quae* peperit ei Nadab *et* Abiu *et* Eleazar *et* Ithamar 24 filii *quoque* Core Asir *et* Helcana *et* Abiasab hae sunt cognationes Coritarum 25 *at vero* Eleazar filius Aaron accepit uxorem de filiabus Phutihel *quae* peperit ei Finees hii sunt principes familiarum leviticarum per cognationes suas (6:15–25)

The various clause connectors in the family list of 6:20–25 (*autem*, *-que*, *quoque*, *et*, *quae*, *at vero*) contrasts with the use of only *et* in 6:15–19. This reflects a distinction between Amram's line and the rest of the tribes. The mention of wives only in the list of Amram's descendants further emphasizes this differentiation. Finally, *at vero* proleptically highlights the difference between the sons of Korah and Eleazer, perhaps an allusion to the Korah rebellion that occurs later (Numbers 16–18).

34. Exod 20:18

MT (20:16) וְכָל־הָעָם רֹאִים אֶת־הַקּוֹלֹת וְאֶת־הַלְפִידִם וְאֵת קוֹל הַשֹּׁפָר וְאֶת־הַהָרָה עָשָׂן
וַיֵּרָא הָעָם וַיַּעֲזוּ וַיַּעֲמְדוּ מֵרָחֹק

IH *cunctus autem* populus videbat voces et lampadas et sonitum bucinæ montemque fumantem et perterriti ac pavore concussi steterunt procul

LXX *Kαὶ* πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα τὴν φωνὴν καὶ τὰς λαμπάδας καὶ τὴν φωνὴν τῆς σάλπιγγος καὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ καπνίζον· φοβηθέντες δὲ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἔστησαν μακρόθεν.

Exod 24:16–17

MT וַיֵּשְׁבִן כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה עַל־הָר סִינַי וַיִּכְסְהוּ הָעָן שְׁשֶׁת יָמִים וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים מִשָּׁה בְּיוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי
בֵּיעִי מִתּוֹךְ הָעָן: יוֹ וּמִרְאָה כְבוֹד יְהוָה כָּאֵשׁ אֲכָלָת בְּרָאשׁ הָהָר לְעֵינֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

- IH *et habitavit gloria Domini super Sinai tegens illum nube sex diebus septimo autem die vocavit eum de medio caliginis 17 erat autem species gloriae Domini quasi ignis ardens super verticem montis in conspectu filiorum Israhel*
- LXX καὶ κατέβη ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σιναι, καὶ ἐκάλυψεν αὐτὸ ἡ νεφέλη ἕξ ἡμέρας· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν κύριος τὸν Μωυσήν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἐκ μέσου τῆς νεφέλης. 17 τὸ δὲ εἶδος τῆς δόξης κυρίου ὥσει πῦρ φλέγον ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ ὄρους ἐναντίον τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ.

Autem in 20:18 and 24:17 has particularly noteworthy significance even though they both logically follow from the context. In Exod 20:18, the *autem* highlights the contrast between Moses, who hears the ten commandments, and the people, who focus on the visual spectacle. Similarly, in Exod 24:17, Jerome underscores the difference between actual glory of God and the appearance of the glory. Thus, the Latin register pushes him to view phenomena antithetically where the Hebrew avoids stark contrast.

35. Exod. 1:15–16

- MT טו וַיֹּאמֶר מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם לְמִלְדֹּת הָעִבְרִית אֲשֶׁר שָׂם הָאֱחָת שְׁפָרָה וְשֵׁם הַשְּׂנִית פּוּעָה: טו וַיֹּאמֶר בְּיָלְדָךְ אֶת־הָעִבְרִית וְרֵאִיתָ עַל־הָאֲבָנִים אֶם־בֶּן הוּא וְהִמָּתֵן אִתּוֹ וְאִם־בַּת הוּא וְחָיָה
- IH *dixit autem rex Aegypti obstetricibus Hebraeorum quarum una vocabatur Sephra altera Phua 15 praecipiens eis quando obstetricabitis Hebraeas et partus tempus advenerit si masculus fuerit interficite illum si femina reservate*
- LXX Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ταῖς μαίαις τῶν Εβραίων, τῇ μιᾷ αὐτῶν, ἣ ὄνομα Σεπφωρα, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δευτέρας Φουα, 16 καὶ εἶπεν "Ὅταν μαιοῦσθε τὰς Εβραίας καὶ ὦσιν πρὸς τῷ τίκτειν, ἐὰν μὲν ἄρσεν ᾦ, ἀποκτείνετε αὐτό, ἐὰν δὲ θήλυ, περιποιεῖσθε αὐτό.

Exod 2:21–22

- MT כא וַיֹּאֶל מֹשֶׁה לְשִׁבָּת אֶת־הָאִישׁ וַיֵּתֵן אֶת־צִפְרָה בְּתוֹ לְמִשָּׁה: כב וַתֵּלֶד בֶּן וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ גֶרְשָׁם כִּי אָמַר גֵּר הָיִיתִי בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם
- IH *iuravit ergo Moses quod habitaret cum eo accepitque Sefforam filiam eius 22 quae peperit filium quem vocavit Gersam dicens advena fui in terra aliena*
- LXX κατωκίσθη δὲ Μωυσῆς παρὰ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ ἐξέδοτο Σεπφωραν τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ Μωυσῆ γυναικα. 22 ἐν γαστρὶ δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ γυνὴ ἔτεκεν

υἷόν, καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν Μωυσῆς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Γηρσαμ λέγων ὅτι Πάροικός εἰμι ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ.

In addition to clarifying paratactic relationships, Jerome responds to the paratactic style by eliminating it altogether. On the one hand, he certainly is interested in clarifying the relationship between clauses. On the other hand, he does not consistently avoid parataxis. He commonly avoids parataxis by employing participles and relative clauses. For example, he reads *praecipiens* (Exod 1:16) for וַיֹּאמֶר (paratactic in LXX), thereby syntactically connecting Exod 1:16 to Exod 1:15.⁸⁹ He can also employ the relative clause. For example, in Exod 2:21–22, *quae peperit filium* joins the two verses together.⁹⁰ The longer period, so typical of Latin style, reflects a Latin view of time. The Hebrew suggests more of a gap between Moses agreeing to dwell with the Midianites, his marriage to Zipporah, and the birth of Gershom, while the Latin views these events as more intimately joined and following each other in close sequence.

36. Exod 1:18

MT וַיִּקְרָא מֶלֶךְ-מִצְרַיִם לְמִיֶּלֶדֶת וַיֹּאמֶר לָהּ

IH *quibus ad se accersitis rex ait*

LXX ἐκάλεσεν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου τὰς μαίας καὶ εἶπεν αὐταῖς

The target language predominates here not only with the characteristically Latin avoidance of parataxis but also with the resumptive relative in ablative absolute. Such an avoidance of parataxis undeniably illustrates a conscious attempt to Latinize the Hebrew. In addition, by connecting Exod 1:18 to Exod 1:17, which describes the midwives' piety to Yahweh, IH reflects a far greater sensitivity to the antithesis between God and Pharaoh than we find in MT.

37. Exod 6:12

MT וַיְדַבֵּר מֹשֶׁה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לֵאמֹר הֵן בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא-שָׁמְעוּ אֵלַי וְאִידֹּי שָׁמְעוּנִי פֶרְעֹה וְאֲנִי עֹרֵל שְׂפָתַיִם

IH *respondit Moses coram Domino ecce filii Israhel non me audiunt et quomodo audiet me Pharao praesertim cum sim incircumciscus labiis*

89 Likewise, Jerome reads *dicens* for וַיֹּאמֶר in Exod 2:10.

90 Similarly, וַיִּתְּהַר הָאִשָּׁה in Exod 2:2 is subordinated in IH with *quae concepit*, while LXX (καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβεν) preserves the parataxis. In Exod. 2:21–22, LXX must have a different *Vorlage* than IH, since the paraphrastic ἐν γαστρὶ δὲ λαβοῦσα realizes *וַתִּהַר. Nonetheless, the presence of the δέ indicates that LXX preserves parataxis more than IH.

LXX ἐλάλησεν δὲ Μωυσῆς ἔναντι κυρίου λέγων Ἰδοὺ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ εἰσήκουσάν μου, καὶ πῶς εἰσακούσεται μου Φαραώ; **ἐγὼ δὲ ἄλογός εἰμι.**

The canons of Latin style correlate with syntactic subordination that also has a semantic valence. Thus, a subordinating particle indicates the semantic relationship between clauses. Here Latinizing involves an explicit interpretive move, although the interpretation may follow from the context. This interpretive move derives from a proclivity in Latin thought to identify causality and purpose. For example, although not in the Hebrew, *praesertim cum* ‘especially since [I am of uncircumcised lips]’ in Exod 6:12 makes it abundantly clear why the Israelites and Pharaoh would ignore Moses. Nevertheless, the causal relationship between “they will not hear me” and “I am of uncircumcised lips” logically follows from the context.

Other examples of subordination specifying relationships between clauses include showing **purpose**: **וַתִּבְאֶנָּה וַתִּדְלֶנָּה**=*quae venerunt ad hauriendas aquas* (Exod 2:16); **וַנֵּיבֹמַר בְּמִדְבָּר וְנִבְחָה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ**=*ibimus viam trium dierum per solitudinem ut immolemus Domino Deo nostro* (Exod 3:18); **וְהָיָה הַמִּשְׁכָּן אֶחָד**=*vela iungenda sunt ut unum tabernaculum fiat* (Exod 26:6); **וְהָיָה נִבּוֹן לְבָקֶר וְעֹלִיתַי בְּבָקֶר אֶל־**=*esto paratus mane ut ascendas statim in montem Sinai* (Exod 34:2) or **causality/temporal priority**: **וַיִּשְׁקֵן וַיִּשְׁעֶן וַיִּשְׁקֵן וַיִּשְׁעֶן**=*et defensis puellis adaquavit oves earum* (Exod 2:17).

38. Exod 7:3

MT וְאֲנִי אֶקְשֶׁה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְהִרְבֵּיתִי אֶת־אֲתַתִּי וְאֶת־מִוִּפְתֵּי בָאָרֶץ מִצְרַיִם
 IH *sed ego indurabo cor eius et multiplicabo signa et ostenta mea in terra Aegypti*
 LXX ἐγὼ δὲ σκληρυνῶ τὴν καρδίαν Φαραώ καὶ πληθυνῶ τὰ σημεῖά μου καὶ τὰ τέρατα ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ.

How, then, do we account for cases such as Exod 7:3 where IH sometimes preserves the parataxis? Although we might expect a purpose clause from the Hebrew **וְאֲנִי אֶקְשֶׁה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְהִרְבֵּיתִי אֶת־אֲתַתִּי** ‘I will harden (Pharaoh’s heart) and I will multiply (my signs)’, Jerome, like the versions, avoids subordination: *indurabo cor eius et multiplicabo signa*. Perhaps he wishes to capture the natural cadences of speech which tend to eschew hypotaxis.

3.4.3 Simplification

39. Exod 39:3

- MT וַיִּרְקְעוּ אֶת־פָּחִי הַזֶּהב וְקָצַץ פְּתִילִם לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּתוֹךְ הַתְּכֵלֶת וּבְתוֹךְ הָאַרְגָּמָן
וּבְתוֹךְ תוֹלַעַת הַשָּׁנִי וּבְתוֹךְ הַשֵּׁשׁ מַעֲשֶׂה חֹשֶׁב
- IH *opere polymitaro inciditque bratteas aureas et extenuavit in fila ut
possint torqueri cum priorum colorum subtemine*
- LXX (36:10⁹¹) καὶ ἐτμήθη τὰ πέταλα τοῦ χρυσοῦς τρίχες ὥστε συνυφᾶναι σὺν τῇ
ὑακίνθῳ καὶ τῇ πορφύρᾳ καὶ σὺν τῷ κοκκίνῳ τῷ διανενησμένῳ καὶ
σὺν τῇ βύσσῳ τῇ κεκλωσμένῃ ἔργον ὑφαντόν.

Exod 28:14

- MT וְשְׁתֵּי שְׂרָשֵׁרֶת זָהָב טְהוֹר מְגַבְּלֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם מַעֲשֶׂה עֵבֶת וְנִתְּתָה אֶת־שְׂרָשֵׁרֶת
הָעֵבֶת עַל־הַמְּשָׁבָצַת
- IH *et duas catenulas auri purissimi sibi invicem coherentes quas inseres
uncinis*

Exod 28:22

- MT שְׂרָשֵׁת גְּבֵלֶת מַעֲשֶׂה עֵבֶת זָהָב טְהוֹר
- IH *facies in rationali catenas sibi invicem coherentes ex auro purissimo*

Exod 28:24

- MT וְנִתְּתָה אֶת־שְׁתֵּי עֵבֶתֶת הַזָּהָב עַל־שְׁתֵּי הַטְּבָעֹת אֶל־קְצוֹת הַחֹשֶׁן
- IH *catenasque aureas iunges anulis qui sunt in marginibus eius*

Exod 39:18–20

- MT וְאֵת שְׁתֵּי קְצוֹת שְׁתֵּי הָעֵבֶתֶת נָתַנוּ עַל־שְׁתֵּי הַמְּשָׁבָצַת וַיִּתְּנָם עַל־כְּתֹפֶת הָאָפֶד
אֶל־מֹול פָּנָיו: יֵט וַיַּעֲשׂוּ שְׁתֵּי טְבָעֹת זָהָב וַיְשִׁימוּ עַל־שְׁנֵי קְצוֹת הַחֹשֶׁן עַל־שְׁפָתוֹ
אֲשֶׁר אֶל־עֵבֶר הָאָפֶד בֵּיתָה: כ וַיַּעֲשׂוּ שְׁתֵּי טְבָעֹת זָהָב וַיִּתְּנָם עַל־שְׁתֵּי כְּתֹפֶת הָאָפֶד
מִלְמַטָּה מִמֹּול פָּנָיו לַעֲמֹת מִחֻבְרָתוֹ מִמַּעַל לְחֹשֶׁב הָאָפֶד
כֹּא וַיִּרְבְּסוּ אֶת־הַחֹשֶׁן מִטְּבָעָתָיו אֶל־טְבָעֹת הָאָפֶד בְּפִתִּיל תְּכֵלֶת לִהְיוֹת עַל־חֹשֶׁב
הָאָפֶד וְלֹא־יִזַּח הַחֹשֶׁן מֵעַל הָאָפֶד כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה
- IH *haec et ante et retro ita conveniebant sibi ut superumerale et rationale
mutuo necterentur 19 stricta ad balteum et anulis fortius copulata quos
iungebat vitta hyacinthina ne laxe fluerent et a se invicem moverentur
sicut praecepit Dominus Mosi*

91 On the difference between MT and LXX on the order of the verses in chapters 36–39, see below, p. 127.

Exod 12:5

MT	שֶׁהַתָּמִים זָכָר בְּדֹשָׁנָה יְהִיָּה לָכֶם מִן־הַכֹּבְשִׁים וּמִן־הָעִזִּים תִּקְחוּ
IH	<i>erit autem agnus absque macula masculus anniculus iuxta quem ritum tolletis et hedum</i>
LXX	πρόβατον τέλειον ἄρσεν ἐνιαύσιον ἔσται ὑμῖν· ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρίφων λήμψεσθε.

Exod 26:4

MT	וְעָשִׂיתָ לְלֹאֵת תְּכַלֵּת עַל שְׁפַת הַיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת מִקְצֵה בַחֲבֶרֶת וְכֵן תַּעֲשֶׂה בְשֵׁפֶת הַיְרִיעָה הַקִּיצוֹנָה בְּמַתְּבֵרֶת הַשְּׁנִיָּת
IH	<i>ansulas hyacinthinas in lateribus ac summitatibus facies cortinarum ut possint invicem copulari</i>

Not only does Jerome add to the Hebrew, he also subtracts and substitutes in order to simplify particular phrases.⁹² Thus, he assumes that certain words are redundant or irrelevant and emends the Hebrew accordingly. It should also be noted that most of these cases belong to technical legal material. These constitute instances where genre influences the character of the translation.⁹³

The rendering of Exod 39:3 where *priorum colorum* ‘of the previous colors’ substitutes for a list of specific colors provides an excellent example. IH clearly omits Hebrew terms, but this simplification cannot be attributed to the Greek tradition. Rather, it can easily be gleaned from the Hebrew. Jerome similarly avoids redundancy in Exod 28:14 and Exod 28:22. The reason he renders מעשה עבות in Exod 28:14 and Exod 28:22 as *invicem cohaerentes* ‘alternately joining’ can be found in Exod 28:24 where he renders עבות as *catenae*. *Catenae* (or *catenula*) appears in 28:14 and 28:22, too, but as a translation of a different Hebrew word, שרשרת. Therefore, he clearly considers שרשרת and עבות synonymous. Since 28:14 and 28:22 have both שרשרת and עבות, he risks redundancy if he renders both terms as *catenae*. Instead, he emends the Hebrew to clarify precisely how the chains join together. A comparison between MT Exod 39:18–21 and IH Exod 39:18–19 indicates that Jerome paraphrases the Hebrew of 39:18–20 while resuming a more literal translation in 39:21. Rather than reiterate the details of the breastplate and tunic, he uses the *ut* and *ne* clauses to focus on the functionality of the design of the priestly vestments. We find a similar interest in expressing functionality in Exod 12:5. In the first part of 12:5, *erit . . . anniculus*, he renders the Hebrew word for word while *juxta etc.* ‘according to which rite

92 On omission, see van der Louw, *Transformations*, 76–78.

93 See Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge, 2002) 83–131 and above, p. 59.

you will also take the goat' paraphrases 'from the sheep and from the goats you shall take', thus omitting מן־הכבשים. While Jerome's simplification makes conceptual sense, he happens to contradict rabbinic tradition. According to the Mekhilta, one may sacrifice either a lamb or a goat. The future *tolletis* rather than the subjunctive indicates both are sacrificed ('according to which rite you will *also* take a goat').⁹⁴ Likewise, for Exod 26:4's וְכֵן תַּעֲשֶׂה בְּשַׁפַּת הִירֵעָה הַקִּיצוֹנָה, Jerome renders only בְּמַחְבֶּרֶת הַשְּׁנִיָּית (ut possint invicem copulari 'so that they can be alternately joined'), simplifying his explanation of how the Tabernacle is to be constructed. Thus, he will emend the Hebrew of legal sections in order to simplify descriptions and clarify the function of particular instructions.⁹⁵

3.5 Summary and Conclusion: Translation Theory and the Historical Moment

The influence of the target language and culture on a translation is a commonplace in translation studies.⁹⁶ In this chapter, I have demonstrated that the translational shifts in the target text reflect a particular element associated with Jerome and his context, late antique Latin philology. In a time of flourishing interest in Latin grammar, Jerome's translation reflects the understanding of the Latin language of his time, and this impacts his approach to the Hebrew. Thus, his attention to pronunciation, phrasing, emphasis, semantics, and syntax correlates with the interests of the Latin grammatical tradition in which he was schooled. The application of grammatical categories in the translation clarifies the Hebrew. These clarifications indicate that the following elements are involved in rendering the sense of a text: explaining Hebrew idioms, specifying terms, maintaining narrative and technical logic, creating vivid images, producing clearer Latin, realizing connotations, and adding emphasis.

94 מן הכשבים ומן העזים. מזה בפני עצמו ומזה בפני עצמו. אתה אומר כן או אינו אלא שיביא מן משניה' כאחת ת"ל (ויקרא א') ואם מן הצאן קרבנו מזה בפני עצמו ומזה בפני עצמו (Mekhilta [Bo. 4]).

95 Not all simplifications appear in the legal sections of Exodus. In the narrative portions about the plague of the locusts, Jerome uses one word, *residuum*, where MT (and LXX) have the three synonyms: אֶת־יִתֵּר הַפְּלִטָּה הַנִּשְׁאַרֶּת 'extra remaining remnant' (Exod 10:5). This suggests he applied the principle of avoiding redundancy.

96 E.g., Gideon Toury, "A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?," *BIOSSCS* 39 (2006): 13–25 and Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 1–6.

Although universal translational shifts that characterize a free translation from a literal orientation could account for these renditions that differ from the Masoretic Text, I argue that the role of the Latin grammatical tradition merits serious consideration. Not only was Jerome aware of the grammatical categories *lectio*, *enarratio*, and *emendatio*, these categories account for renditions that follow the Hebrew but have significant exegetical implications. Especially prominent is the application of *enarratio*, or “explanation” of difficult passages including unusual words, figures of speech, and complex syntax. The clearest example is the addition of grammarians’ language marking the presence of glosses in Exod 36:27 (‘opposite the West . . . , that is, on the side of the Tabernacle that faces the sea’), Exod 16:15 (‘which means what is this’), and Exod 15:23 (‘whence he coined a name appropriate to the place’). *Variatio*, although less explicit, predominates in Vg Exodus and is a common principle in the grammatical tradition. Moreover, in addition to serving stylistic interests, variation provides the opportunity for exegesis as in Exod 1:1; 17:11; and 9:3–7. In the case of Exod 10:11, the additions of “only” in “only the men,” “you yourselves” in “you yourselves seek,” and “immediately” in “they were immediately cast out” are not required even though they do not violate the sense of the Hebrew. Jerome’s familiarity with the grammatical concept of emphasis explains this non-obligatory shift. His awareness that Scripture includes metaphorical expressions is evident in the addition and extension of poetic tropes and metaphors (Exod 3:5; 9:2; 12:12–27; 13:17; 14:27; and 25:10). His explicit awareness of different conventions concerning number in Hebrew and Latin accounts for the changes between singular and plural in Exod 1:1; 24:1; and 24:9. Given the correlations between his explicit knowledge of specific elements of Latin grammar and transformations of the Hebrew, it is safe to consider late antique Latin grammar as a whole in order to explain translational shifts. This includes attention to Latin verb tense (Exod 1:17; 4:15; and 21:5), periphrasis to avoid Hebraisms (Exod 1:14; 4:7; and 9:20), and *historia* for technical accuracy (Exod 5:7; 39:6; and 39:14).

Enarratio accounts for numerous non-obligatory shifts dependent solely on the Hebrew. *Lectio* and *emendatio* provide a framework for understanding obligatory shifts. For instance, the homography-based and homophony-based renderings of Exod 8:22; 18:18; and 27:6 exemplify the application of *lectio* to interpretation. How one pronounces the text necessitates a particular translation. Jerome’s understanding of *emendatio*, “correction of mistakes,” may have obligated him to improve upon the Hebrew or the *Vorlagen*. In antiquity, *emendatio* was a broader category than fixing a text based on textual variants. For example, Jerome’s rendering of Exod 8:10 clarifies the Hebrew and

Greek, and the Latin of Exod 2:5 and 6:26 makes more contextual sense than the Hebrew. The simplification of legal material in Exod 12:5; Exod 26:4; Exod 28:14; Exod 28:22; Exod 28:24; Exod 39:18–20; and Exod 39:3 also improves the Hebrew. The most common correction of the Hebrew and the predominant characteristic of his translation technique is the connection of clauses through various particles, participles, and subordinate clauses. Where the Hebrew has a neutral paratactic style, the Vulgate contrasts clauses (e.g., Exod 20:18 and 24:17) and indicates purpose (e.g., Exod 2:16 and 3:18) and causality (Exod 2:17).

The elements discussed here represent interpretations that arise from Jerome's direct encounter with the Hebrew text, like Philo's scholars in their separate cells. Unlike Philo's legendary version, however, Jerome's process is more complex because he did not always translate alone. His renditions can also reflect, as in the story of Aristeas, a conversation with other translators: the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the Old Latin. In the next chapter, we will examine the interpretive results of this conversation.

The Critical Use of the Septuagint and Versions

4.1 Introductory Remarks

In the previous two chapters, I described the philological aspect of Jerome's translation technique of *recentiores*-rabbinic philology. In addition to translational shifts resulting from typical translation norms, his knowledge of Hebrew combined with late antique Latin grammatical rubrics produced numerous examples of translations with interpretive significance. In several instances, however, the renditions cannot be explained as encounters with the Hebrew text alone. Rather, he could be relying on traditions preserved in the various Greek and Latin versions of the Bible or in Jewish, Christian, and Classical exegetical sources. In the next chapters, I will examine translations based on these Jewish, Christian, and Classical interpretive traditions. In this chapter, I will demonstrate that consideration of renditions based on the Greek and Latin translations and the available recensions (*recentiores*) represents another component of Jerome's translation technique. While he could be unconsciously translating an exegetical tradition preserved in the versions before him, I will show that he continues to apply his Hebrew erudition when considering his Greek sources. I will not be adding to the extensive discussion concerning why he moved from the translation *iuxta Septuaginta* (LXX) to the *iuxta Hebraeos* (IH).¹ Rather, I intend to explore more deeply the exegetical function of the Septuagint (LXX) and versions—Vetus Latina (VL), Aquila (α'), Symmachus (σ'), and Theodotion (θ') in relation to the *iuxta Hebraeos*.² This

1 For further explanation on Jerome's move from LXX to MT, see W. Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 110–37; J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975), 153–67; Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 60–62; Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 49–58.

2 Scholars of course acknowledge the influence of LXX and the versions on IH. However, few go beyond this acknowledgment, and those that do only collect examples of IH readings dependent on LXX and the versions without explaining the connection between these parallels and Jerome's method. See, e.g., H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 474; Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 254; H. F. D. Sparks, "Jerome as Biblical Scholar," *CHB* 1 (1970): 513, 517, 525, 530–32; Kelly, *Jerome*, 161–62; Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein, "The

requires combining the fact that the Vetus Latina/Septuagint played a significant role in Jerome's communities, the Latin and Greek Churches, as well as his interest in Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, with an examination of references to predecessors, himself, and readers as comparers of translations. The *certamina interpretum* 'competition of translators' (*Prol. Hes.*) functions on two levels: textual and exegetical. Comparative translation on a textual level involves the consideration of various texts—Masoretic Text, Septuagint, Vetus Latina, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion—before rendering into Latin *iuxta Hebraeos*. By "exegetical translation" I mean a rendition related to interpretive traditions expressed in patristic, Jewish, and/or Classical sources that may or may not be in dialogue with the textual *Vorlagen*. Since Hebrew or Greek *Vorlagen* provide the simplest explanation for a particular Latin rendering, these must be considered first before positing an exegetical tradition. Even so, as we have seen in the case of the Hebrew, Jerome more than mechanically translates into Latin. He is constantly making interpretive decisions. Therefore, here I focus on a precise description of how he utilized his Greek textual sources without precluding the possibility that textual issues relate to exegetical issues. The next chapters focus on those Latin renditions that the Hebrew and Greek biblical versions cannot explain.

Jerome has three options available for employing the Septuagint and versions. He can copy them verbatim, paraphrase them, or employ them critically—in other words, selectively or in combination. In order to evaluate the extent to which he exercises these options, three preliminary issues must be considered that affect this analysis:

1. What texts of the Septuagint, Vetus Latina, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion did he have before him?
2. How did he himself view these texts?
3. What method determined his use of particular versions?

After discussing these questions, it will be possible to examine the factors governing Jerome's utilization of the other translations.

Latin Translations," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling, CRINT 2.1 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 323; and David McCarthy, "Some Useful Things Worth Knowing about the Vulgate and Jerome," *SBLSP* (1994): 324.

4.2 Jerome's Greek *Vorlagen*

With respect to the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, three possibilities exist: Jerome employed either the Hexapla itself, a Hexaplaric edition of the Septuagint with marginal readings from the *recentiores*, or separate editions of each version. Although at some point he may have seen Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion as separate works or in marginal readings,³ the evidence indicates that he employed the Hexapla for at least his rendition of the Pentateuch in *iuxta Hebraeos*. His description of his translation as a kind of manual edition of the Hexapla, "so they have an edition to substitute for the Greek Hexapla, which requires enormous expense and labor,"⁴ indicates that he used the Hexapla extensively since he understood its unwieldiness. Taken in connection with a claim to have toiled immensely on the Pentateuch at the beginning of the preface to Joshua, it is certain that he relied heavily on the Hexapla for his translation of the Pentateuch.⁵ Although Jerome does not specify how he used Origen's magnum opus here, the columnar format of the Greek work, his many references to comparative translation, as well as the comparative analyses in his commentaries on Scripture all point to analytical use of the Hexapla. This critical evaluation of the various translations based on the Hexapla derives from his understanding of Origen's work. Origen inspired Jerome's critical approach to the Septuagint because Origen mingled the text with Theodotion and indicated the omissions and additions with the asterisk and obelus (*Prol. Pent.* 8–11).⁶ Origen uses Theodotion to correct the Septuagint, while indicating the correction. Two relevant points emerge from Jerome's description of Origen's work in the prologue to Chronicles.

And certainly not only did Origen arrange the copies of the four texts transcribing single words exactly opposite so that one version could be immediately identified as disagreeing with the rest which were in agreement, he also, which is even more bold, mixed the edition of Theodotion

3 Jerome, *Epist.* 32.1 and *Ruf.* 2.34. See also above, pp. 24–25.

4 *Ut pro Graecorum εξαπλοις, quae et sumptu et labore maximo indigent, editionem habeant* (Jerome, *Praef. Jos.* 9–10).

5 Although Jerome at times worked rapidly on translations, this does not apply to the Pentateuch: *tandem finita Pentateucho Mosi, velut grandi fenore liberati...* (*Praef. Jos.* 1). This extra care can be explained by the fact that Jerome recognized the Pentateuch as being rendered by the seventy(-two) scholars in Alexandria under Ptolemy II; see Swete, *Introduction*, 23 and Schwarz, p.31. Such a recognition would enhance the textual authority of LXX Pentateuch in Jerome's eyes.

6 See also *Prol. Job* 5–7.

with that of the Septuagint, marking with asterisks whatever was missing and with obeli whatever seemed added.⁷

In the first place, he clearly admired Origen's work. In the second place, he saw the Hexapla as facilitating (*statim*) critical comparison of texts.⁸ Such a comparative use corresponds with his description of the Hexapla's role in the Greek churches where Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion are considered in the Hexapla and are explained by churchmen.⁹

4.3 Jerome's View of the Septuagint and Versions

Defining Jerome's attitude toward the Septuagint and *recentiores* involves two issues. In the first place, the *recentiores* as a whole play a role in his critique of the Septuagint.¹⁰ In the second place, he has a particular view of the

7 *Et certe Origenes non solum exempla composuit quattuor editionum e regione singula verba describens, ut unus dissentiens statim ceteris inter se consentientibus arguatur, sed, quod maioris audaciae est, in editione Septuaginta Theodotionis editionem miscuit, asteriscis designans quae minus fuerint, et virgulis quae ex superfluo videantur adposita* (Jerome, *Prol. Par.*).

8 Origen utilizes the *recentiores* comparatively in two ways: in order to judge between variants in the manuscripts of the Septuagint on account of their closeness to the Hebrew and as sources for exegesis (Kamesar, *Jerome*, 5, 24–25). Kamesar calls the latter method Origen's "exegetical maximalism." Thus, according to the prologue of *Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*, according to Jerome, "Origen seeks the help, meanwhile, of a foreign language" (*Origen interdum linguae peregrinae quaerit auxilia*). This exegetical maximalism included for Origen the use of the *recentiores* to explain the Septuagint, clear up ambiguities, extend the sense of a word, corroborate an interpretation, construct a single point, and explain or translate etymologies (Kamesar, *Jerome*, 24–25). Kamesar goes on to argue that Jerome viewed Origen as utilizing the *recentiores* for the most part exegetically rather than textually.

9 *Aquila, et Symmachus ac Theodotion . . . in ἐξαπλοῖς habentur apud ecclesias et explanantur ab ecclesiasticis viris* (*Prol. Job.* 44–45). Similarly, *Graecorum . . . qui post Septuaginta translatores . . . Aquilam videlicet, Symmachum et Theodotionem, et* [Codex Amiatinus omits the *et*] *curiose legunt et per Origenis laborem in ἐξαπλοῖς ecclesiis dedicarunt* (*Prol. Esr.* 33–36). See also Kelly, *Jerome*, 135. Kamesar, *Jerome*, 72 n. 18 adopts the view that Jerome was exposed to the *recentiores* through separate editions and commentaries. He does not deny that Jerome utilized the Hexapla for the *iuxta Hebraeos* but rather argues against the assertion that Jerome's interest in the Hebrew began later in life, after he saw the Hexapla.

10 The *recentiores* reveal a gap between MT and LXX and they rank on the same level as LXX because they are one degree removed from MT (unlike VL) and they replace LXX in the case of Daniel (Kamesar, *Jerome*, 44–46, see also 58–72).

translations qua translations. Since he describes the Septuagint and versions in terms of their sense and style, he suggests how and why he might utilize the *recentiores* in his translation.

I am not, to be sure, discussing the Old Testament, which has reached us [in the New Testament] third after being translated into Greek by the seventy elders. Nor do I seek what Aquila, what Symmachus understand, why Theodotion moves in between the new and the old translators. Let the true translation be that which the Apostles approved.¹¹

Here Jerome clarifies that he does not apply textual criticism to the scriptural quotations in the Gospel against the Septuagint and versions.¹² Nevertheless, the statement “Now I am speaking about the New Testament” suggests that at other times the analysis of these versions may be relevant to establishing a translation. When he describes his own translation as not following “any of the ancient translators, but based on the Hebrew itself, and Arabic, and sometimes Aramaic” and echoing “at times the words, at times the sense, at times the both simultaneously,”¹³ he does not mean that he ignores the Septuagint and versions but that he does not prefer one over the other. This reading especially seems likely because of the explicit use of stylistic terms particularly associated with each version: *nunc verba* (Aquila), *nunc sensus* (Symmachus), *nunc simul utrumque resonabit* (Theodotion).¹⁴ According to the preface to Isaiah, there are two reasons for using the versions: support for dogma (*studium doctrinae*) or greater understanding of the Septuagint (*ut Septuaginta magis ex*

11 *Neque vero ego de Veteri disputo Testamento, quod a septuaginta senioribus in graecam linguam versum tertio gradu ad nos usque pervenit. Non quaero quid Aquila quid Symmachus sapiant, quare Theodotion inter novos et veteres medius incedat; sit illa vera interpretatio quam Apostoli probaverunt* (Praef. Ev. 16–19).

12 Schwarz, pp. 27–28, on the other hand, argues from this passage that Jerome recommends the use of the same version that the apostles approved. This cannot be correct because Jerome argues elsewhere that the apostles translated from the Hebrew themselves (*Epist.* 57.7.1). See also Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus: Liber de optimo genere interpretandi* [*Epistula* 57]. *Ein Kommentar*, Mnemosyne Supplement 61 (Leiden: Brill, 1980). Hence, Jerome really means that, as far as his translation of the Gospels is concerned, scriptural citations need not be standardized against an official translation. Rather, he will let the extemporaneous translation of the apostles stand.

13 *Haec autem translatio nullum de veteribus sequitur interpretem, sed ex ipso hebraico arabicoque sermone et interdum syro, nunc verba, nunc sensus, nunc simul utrumque resonabit* (*Prol. Job* 15–17).

14 See below for a more detailed discussion of how Jerome conceptualized the styles of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

conlatione eorum intellegant).¹⁵ These reasons emerge from the belief that variations in the Septuagint were made intentionally by the Jewish translators—*Iudaei prudenti factum dicunt esse consilio* (*Prol. Pent.* 21)—and included translating differently or omitting words completely—*aut aliter interpretati sunt aut omnino tacuerunt* (*Prol. Pent.* 24–25).¹⁶ Indeed, even others besides Jerome considered Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus as sources for the Hebrew. In response to a dispute with a Jew who asserted that the Septuagint disagreed with the Hebrew, Sofronius demands that he translate the Psalms into Latin in accordance with Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion: *postulasti ut post Aquilam, Symmachum et Theodotionem novam editionem latino sermone transferrem* (*Praef. Ps. IH* 21–22). Thus, other translations help define the text's meaning.

Even if the versions may be useful for accessing the Hebrew, Jerome does not offer an unqualified endorsement of them. Rather, he seems to have a contradictory attitude towards Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion because he both praises and blames them. For example, the versions are judaizing and dishonest.¹⁷ This reluctance to fully embrace the *recentiores* may depend on his assessment of the style of translations by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion: “word for word, sense for sense, or an intermediate form of translation combined from both approaches.”¹⁸ Thus, recognizing Aquila's Jewish heritage¹⁹ and his prominence in the Jewish community (*Comm. in Ezech.* 3:5), Jerome criticizes the slavish translation of the Akiva school: “I rightly reject that headstrong [*contentiosus*] translator Aquila the proselyte, who not only tried to translate the words, but also the etymologies.”²⁰ On Isa 49:5, he asserts that Aquila was “either feigning ignorance or was duped by the perverse

15 *Prol. Is.* 20–21. On both reasons, see Kamesar, *Jerome*, 59–60, 65–70.

16 Cf. Jerome, *Epist.* 32.1.

17 *Iudaeus Aquila, et Symmachus ac Theodotion iudaizantes heretici sunt recepti, qui multa mysteria Salvatoris subdola interpretatione celarunt* (*Prol. Job* 42–44).

18 *Verbum e verbo, sensum de sensu, ex utroque commixtum et medie temperatum genus translationis* (*Prol. Job* 3–5). It is not clear here whether each one combines the various styles or each one represents a different style. *Praef. Chron. Eus.*, however, affirms the latter understanding: *quamobrem Aquila et Symmachus et Theodotion incitati, diversum paene opus in eodem opere prodiderunt; alio nitente verbum de verbo exprimere, alio sensum potius sequi, tertio non multum a veteribus discrepare*. See also *Prol. Esr.* 34–35.

19 *Scribae et Pharisei quorum suscepit scholam Akybas, quem magistrum Aquilae proselyti autumnant* (Jerome, *Comm. Isa.* 8:14).

20 *Aquilam proselytum et contentiosum interpretem, qui non solum verba, sed etymologias quoque verborum transferre conatus sit, iure proiici a nobis* (*Epist.* 57.11.2). See Bartelink, *Hieronymus*, 106–8; Kedar-Kopfstein, “Latin Translations,” 38.

explanation of the Pharisees.”²¹ On the other hand, in *Epistle* 36.12, we find a positive assessment Aquila’s judicious application of his Hebrew knowledge because he “translates word for word not in a rather headstrong [*contentiosius*] manner as some think, but quite carefully.”²² According to *Epistle* 32.1, Jerome compares (*confero*) the edition (*editio*) of Aquila with the Hebrew to catch any changes maliciously inserted by Jews and also to find renderings that support Christian belief.²³ This comment provides a clue further explaining his contradictory view of Aquila: *confero* ‘compare’ indicates that he employs Aquila critically.²⁴ That is, Aquila may be used, but with caution.

Similarly, Jerome condemns Symmachus as a judaizer (*Prol. Job*), but elsewhere views him positively. For example, on Amos 3:2, “Symmachus is not accustomed to follow the affectation of words, but the order of his understanding”²⁵ and constantly praises Symmachus as being clearer (*manifestius*) and plainer (*apertius*).²⁶ Jerome uses Symmachus most often because of his sensible renderings and elegance.²⁷ Not surprisingly, he applies the generic negative condemnation of Theodotion as a judaizing heretic (*Prol. Job*) and nonbeliever, or *incredulus* (*Prol. Dan.*) but also adopts a neutral position because

21 *aut imperitiam simulantem, aut Pharisaeorum perversa expositione deceptum* (Jerome, *Comm. Isa.* 49:5). See Frederick Field, ed., *Origenes Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1964.), xix–xxi; Swete, *Introduction*, 32–34.

22 *Non contentiosius, ut quidam putant, sed studiosius verbum interpretatur ad verbum*. See M. Johannessohn, “Hieronymus und die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen des Alten Testaments,” *TLZ* 73 (1948): 146–47, who also contends that Jerome viewed Aquila’s etymologies and Hebrew idioms as signs of Hebrew erudition.

23 *Iamdudum cum voluminibus Hebraeorum editionem Aquilae confero, ne quid forsitan propter odium synagoga mutaverit, et—ut amica menti fatear—quae ad nostram fidem pertineant roborandam plura reperio*. Even if the *editio* Aquilae refers to a separate edition (see above, n. 9), *confero* ‘compare’ demonstrates that Jerome reads Aquila in a hexaplaric manner, namely, comparatively.

24 Field, *Origenes Hexaplorum*, xvi–xxv; Swete, *Introduction*, 34; Sidney Jellicoe, *Septuagint and Modern Study*, 80.

25 *Symmachus non solet verborum κακοζήλιαν sed intellegentiae ordinem sequi* (*Comm. Amos* 3:2).

26 Field, *Origenes Hexaplorum*, 28, 30; Swete, *Introduction*, 49–51. For an analysis of these terms, see Bartelink, Hieronymus, 58–59; Kamesar, *Jerome*, 37–38; and Dominique Barthélemy, “Eusèbe, La Septante et ‘les autres,’” in *Études d’histoire du texte de l’Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg: Academic Press, 1978), 51–65.

27 Johannessohn, “Hieronymus,” 147. On Jerome’s preference for Symmachus, see below, p. 115.

of Theodotion's stylistic and semantic similarity with the Septuagint.²⁸ I say "neutral" in part because similarity to the Septuagint need not be considered praise. Nevertheless, like the Septuagint, Theodotion can be useful to Jerome without his unqualified endorsement.²⁹ With regard to the Old Latin, while Jerome often follows the *Vetus Latina* semantically and stylistically in the Prophets, "this situation changes radically in the translations of Biblical books other than the Prophets."³⁰ Notwithstanding, he is always sensitive to the version actually read in Church.³¹

4.4 Jerome's *Recentiores* Translation Technique

I contend that we perceive such a discrepancy in Jerome's attitude towards his sources because he viewed and employed them with critical acumen. The Greek versions represent sources for interpreting the Hebrew to be utilized judiciously.³² Therefore, it should not bewilder us that Jerome articulates both the strengths and weaknesses of the Greek tradition. This explanation for a contradictory view of the Septuagint and versions is supported by the explicit statements that he considered a comparative evaluation of his predecessors essential to the process of translation:

After the many copies of Scriptures scattered throughout the world, I am to sit as a kind of judge and because they vary with each other, I shall determine which are the ones that agree with the Greek truth. It is a pious task, but also a dangerous audacity to judge others as he himself will be judged by all.³³

28 *Simplicitate sermonis a LXX. interpretibus non discordat* (Jerome, *Praef. Ps. ILXX* 13–14) and *Septuaginta et Theodotio . . . in plurimis locis concordant* (Jerome, *Comm. Ecc.* 2). See Field, *Origenes Hexaplorum*, xxxviii–xxxix; Swete, *Introduction*, 42.

29 According to Johannesson, "Hieronymus," 147, Jerome values Theodotion's transliterations.

30 Kedar-Kopfstein, "Latin Translations," 45. For Jerome's view of the *Vetus Latina* as a translation, see Schwarz, 27–28.

31 *Quod enim semel aures hominum occupaverat et nascentis Ecclesiae roboraverat fidem, iustum erat etiam nostro silentio conprobari* (*Prol. Par.* 3–5).

32 This is a more specific articulation of the idea that Jerome has a "balanced" view "on the relation between his translation from the Hebrew and the older Greek translations" (Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 68).

33 *post exemplaria Scripturarum toto orbe dispersa quasi quidam arbiter sedeam et, quia inter se variant, quae sint illa quae cum graeca consentiant veritate decernam. Pius labor, sed*

According to the preface to Isaiah, not only does Jerome posit a critical reading of a translation, he also specifically identifies the Septuagint and versions as a potential basis for such critical analysis.³⁴ Moreover, historically, Greek Christians were interested in understanding the Septuagint better by comparing it with Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, it follows that subsequent translators like Jerome should analytically consider their predecessors.³⁵ Although he does not specify the Greek and Latin texts, his claim that he renders the Hebrew accurately, read in connection with the invitation to compare his version with Greek and Latin versions or consult any of the Hebrews, again suggests that various translations may be read with a critical eye.³⁶ The clearest endorsement of critical judgment of versions appears in the prologue to Ezra, where he contrasts the uncritical employment of translations with his own critical method:

Even those who have all the copies but are ignorant of the Hebrew language, will make more mistakes because they do not know which of the many copies are more correct. This very thing recently happened

periculosa praesumptio, iudicare de ceteris ipsum ab omnibus iudicandum... (Praef. Ev. 2–5). See Kedar-Kopfstein, “Latin Translations,” 46–48, who notes that already in 379, “Jerome made it a habit of placing before himself the Latin and Greek texts together with a Hebrew text of the Gospel which he had found with the Ebionites at Aleppo and making a comparative study of the versions” (46). Schwarz, 29–30 explains that this comparative method is necessary because the contents of the LXX are inspired, but not the wording/style: “From this the conclusions for the later translator are obvious: the contents of both the original and the inspired translation must be taken into consideration at every step, but so far as the wording is concerned, it is only the original which is binding....”

34 *Nec ignoro... nec facile quempiam posse iudicare de interpretatione* (Jerome, *Prol. Is.*).

35 *Hoc a fastidiosis lectoribus precor, ut quomodo Graeci post Septuaginta translatores Aquilam et Symmachum et Theodotionem legunt vel ob studium doctrinae suae vel ut Septuaginta magis ex conlatione eorum intellegant, sic et isti saltem unum post priores habere dignentur interpretem. Legant prius, et postea despiciant, ne videantur non ex iudicio... damnare* (*Prol. Is.* 18–22). According to the *Prol. Job* 3 and 41, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion are read in combination among the Greeks (but not the Latins).

36 *Mihi omnino conscius non sim mutasse me quippiam de hebraica veritate. Certe si incredulus es, lege graecos codices et latinos et confer cum his opusculis, et ubicumque inter se videris discrepare, interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum... (Prol. Reg.).* *Prol. Hes.* 8 describes Paula and Eustochium's Hebrew knowledge and encourages them to sanction comparative translation: *interpretum certamina conprobastis*. According to *Praef. Ps.* 1H 22–23, Sofronius relies on Jerome's critical judgment to make sense out of the variety of translations: *aiebas enim te magis interpretum varietate turbari et amore quo laberis vel translatione vel iudicio meo esse contentum*.

among the Greeks to a certain, most learned man,³⁷ so that rejecting the actual meaning of Scripture he followed the mistake of any translator he wanted. I, however, who at least have some minor knowledge of Hebrew nor is Latin eloquence lacking from me in any way whatsoever, can both judge other copies better and express in our language what I myself actually understand.³⁸

The studies of Adam Kamesar and Alison Salvesen have provided important contributions to our understanding of the impact of Jerome's relationship to the Greek textual tradition on his method of translation. Kamesar argues that Jerome adapted Greek theory to a Latin context.³⁹ Christian Greek scholars considered the *recentiores* as complementary to the Septuagint. Origen went so far as to consider them equally valid for interpretation. According to Kamesar, Jerome adds a Hebrew component to Origen's "exegetical maximalism," practicing a "*recentiores*-rabbinic-philology" that critically employs the versions and rabbinic tradition to arrive at the correct meaning of the Hebrew.⁴⁰ To be sure, others have noted that he employs the *recentiores* and rabbinic traditions in his interpretations.⁴¹ Kamesar, however, both explains the intellectual

37 Perhaps a reference to Apollinaris of Laodicea, "who, according to Jerome, employed the *recentiores* 'non secundum scientiam' (Ruf. 2.34)" (Kamesar, *Jerome*, 68 n. 110).

38 *Etiam qui [exemplaria omnia] habuerint et hebraei sermonis ignari sunt, magis errabunt ignorantes quis e multis verius dixerit. Quod etiam sapientissimo cuidam nuper apud Graecos accidit, ut interdum Scripturae sensum relinquens uniuscuiuslibet interpretis sequeretur errorem. Nos autem, qui hebraeae linguae saltem parvam habemus scientiam et latinus nobis utcumque sermo non deest, et de aliis magis possumus iudicare et ea quae ipsi intellegimus in nostra lingua expromere* (Prol. Esr. 39–44). Jerome also applies this critical judgment in his commentaries, e.g., he writes: *nullius auctoritatem secutus sum; sed de hebraeo transferens, magis me septuaginta interpretum consuetudini coaptavi, in his dumtaxat, quae non multum ab Hebraicis discrepabant. Interdum Aquilae quoque et Symmachi et Theodotionis recordatus sum ut nec novitate nimia lectoris studium detererem nec rursum contra conscientiam meam fonte veritatis omissio, opinionum rivulos consectorer* (Praef. Comm. Ecc. [388–89 CE]). See Kedar-Kopfstein, "Latin Translations," 70.

39 Kamesar, *Jerome*.

40 Ibid., 81, 95, 176–91.

41 Friedrich Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testament aus der hebraica veritas," *Bib* 10 (1929): 3–30; Cyrus Gordon, "Rabbinic Exegesis in the Vulgate of Proverbs," *JBL* 49 (1930): 384–416. In a typical example, W. W. Cannon, "Jerome and Symmachus: Some Points in the Vulgate Translation of Kohelth," *ZAW* 45 (1927): 191–99 argues that Jerome is indebted to Symmachus for several renderings. However, a close examination of Cannon's list of examples indicates that

background behind Jerome's method as well as the coherence of the method itself.⁴² Nevertheless, Kamesar proves his argument from a commentary, *Quaestiones Hebraicae ad Genesim*, and does not address the question of whether Jerome applied this *recentiores*-rabbinic philology to the *iuxta Hebraeos*.⁴³ The second study, Salvesen's *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*, helps fill this lacuna by collecting data on Jerome's use of the *recentiores*.⁴⁴ While it contains a chapter on the influence of Symmachus on Jerome,⁴⁵ the primary value of the work for us here are the tables⁴⁶ indicating the cases in which he follows Symmachus, the Septuagint, Aquila, and Theodotion. These tables are based on extensive documentation of the Hebrew, Aramaic, *iuxta Hebraeos*, Septuagint, versions, and Syriac renditions for passages of exegetical interest.⁴⁷ Salvesen supports previous studies that identify Jerome's preference for Symmachus.⁴⁸ She accounts for this preference by endorsing M. Johannessohn's contention that Symmachus influenced the *iuxta Hebraeos* stylistically as well as suggesting herself that he found Symmachean support for a Jewish interpretation (either through his Jewish teachers or Origen).⁴⁹ However, she provides no textual examples which demonstrate what Kamesar calls "*recentiores*-rabbinic philology." Moreover, the usefulness of Salvesen's work for our purposes is limited by her emphasis on Symmachus because she does not consider the *Vetus Latina*, nor does she explore all the criteria by which Jerome adopted

Jerome may agree with Symmachus in semantics but not always in syntax. Even quotations of Symmachus in his commentary are not followed precisely. Thus, it is clear that Jerome exercises critical judgment when applying a Symmachean reading.

42 Kamesar, *Jerome*, 96, 97, 103.

43 Kamesar, *Jerome*, 69–70, 81, 103 n. 20 asserts that Jerome's method predominates in the commentaries rather than biblical translation where communal pressure forced him to adhere to the traditional text as much as possible.

44 Alison Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*, JSS Monographs 15 (Manchester: Journal of Semitic Studies, 1991).

45 *Ibid.*, 265–81.

46 *Ibid.*, 266–78.

47 Regrettably, the *Vetus Latina* is absent.

48 Joseph Ziegler, *Die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen als Vorlage der Vulgata in den prophetischen Schriften* (Braunsberg: Staatlichen Akademie, 1943–44); Johannessohn, "Hieronymus," 145–52; M. Johannessohn, "Zur Entstehung der Ausdrucksweise der lateinischen vulgata aus den jüngeren griechischen alt-testamentlichen Übersetzungen," *ZNTW* 44 (1952–53): 90–102. Jellicoe, *Septuagint and Modern Study*, 80 puts the Septuagint before Symmachus and Aquila.

49 Salvesen, *Symmachus*, 279.

one version over another.⁵⁰ Thus, she convincingly demonstrates that he employed the Septuagint and versions in the *iuxta Hebraeos* without clarifying his method.

This does not mean, however, her work has no bearing on whether Jerome critically used the Septuagint and *recentiores* for the *iuxta Hebraeos*. Her evidence at least confirms the idea that he analytically applied the Septuagint and versions to his translation of Exodus. For her tables indicate that he did not exclusively follow one translation. This idea corresponds to the fact that he carefully studied the Septuagint and versions for his translation of the Pentateuch and translated the Pentateuch more freely than other biblical books.⁵¹ In my analysis, I include noncritical, verbatim uses of the Septuagint and versions in part to add to the pot, as it were, but also to provide a standard by which to identify critical use. Moreover, the oft-neglected Vetus Latina is considered as a candidate for influence as well. This collection of data demonstrates that Jerome does indeed copy and paraphrase the Septuagint and versions. However, the fact that he employs different sources at different times and that he even combines sources indicate his critical judgment at work.⁵² Finally, such close textual analysis suggests the bases of his decisions: the attempt to achieve better Latin,⁵³ closeness to the Hebrew, and support from an exegetical tradition.

4.5 Textual Analysis

I will demonstrate two aspects that characterize the relationship of *iuxta Hebraeos* to previous translations: Jerome culls the other versions for semantic and syntactic suggestions, and he employs the versions critically. By critical use

50 Salvesen herself (ibid., 279) recognizes these limitations, adding that Aquila and Theodotion are not always available.

51 Kedar-Kopfstein, "Latin Translations," 284.

52 Ibid., 56–57.

53 Jerome, *Prol. Esr.* 42–44, quoted above, pp. 113–14, reflects Jerome's interest in Latin style. C. Mohrmann, "Mulier. A propos de II Reg 1,26," *VC* 2 (1948): 117–19 analyzes an example in which the Hebrew valence of *mulier* does not correspond with the Latin connotation, citing Augustine on Gal 4:4 (*Sermones* 52,9–10): "For it is a characteristic of Hebrew to apply the term *mulieres* to all women, not just those who have lost their virginity" (*Proprietas enim locutionis Hebraeae mulieres non corruptas virginitate sed feminas appellat*). Harald Hagedahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958), while an excellent study, fails to consider the influence of the Classics on Jerome's biblical translations.

of the translations I mean that he approaches these as possibly useful sources of information, not as texts to be copied. A rational process underlies Jerome's adoption of a particular version. I contend that a critical use of other translations best explains the concurrence of the following phenomena: sometimes he does not follow any of the versions; at other times he follows the Septuagint, the *Vetus Latina*, or one of the *recentiores*; or he reworks a version or combines versions together. Occasional acceptance or rejection of versions by itself can be explained as coincidental, as laziness, or as rote copying but, in light of the fact that Jerome also reworks traditions, acceptance and rejection of a version represents a critical decision.

4.5.1 *Rejection*

Determining if Jerome rejects a particular translation can be problematic because the Vulgate does not explicitly announce that it intentionally avoids the Septuagint and other versions. Nevertheless, I submit that two types of example demonstrate the conscious rejection of predecessors. Both of these types rest on the reasonable assumption that Jerome had a detailed awareness of at least the Septuagint and *Vetus Latina* through his education and previous work on revising the *Vetus Latina*. First, at times the *iuxta Hebraeos* and the Masoretic Text share neither identical nor equivalent syntactic and semantic structures.⁵⁴ At the same time, these renditions in the *iuxta Hebraeos* may have no connection to the Septuagint and other versions. Thus, Jerome is not completely satisfied with directly translating the Hebrew, yet he avoids the Greek translations despite being aware of them. The second type of example involves cases where the translations obviously vary from the Hebrew text, such as by adding or subtracting significant words or by varying the order of chapters and verses. In both types of examples Jerome does not follow the other Greek versions, but it would be difficult to believe that he was ignorant of them.⁵⁵

4.5.1.1 Rejection of Semantics and Syntax of the Translations

4.5.1.1.1 *Semantics*

When God calls out from the burning bush, "Moses, Moses" (Exod 3:4), Moses responds with one word, אֲנִי הֵנָּה 'here I am' (Exod 3:4). Jerome also renders with

54 On the semantic and syntactic differences between the Hebrew and *iuxta Hebraeos* see Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Vulgate as a Translation" (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1968), chapters III and IV and above chapters 2 and 3.

55 It is always possible that an unpreserved version contains Jerome's rendering. On the other hand, the version may not have been preserved precisely because it did not differ from the Septuagint.

one word, *adsum* ‘I am present’, which is semantically closer to the Hebrew than LXX and VL “what is it?” (Τί ἐστίν and *quid est*). *Adsum* is also stylistically superior to α’ and θ’ ἰδοὺ ἐγώ ‘look I’, which is also semantically close to the Hebrew.⁵⁶

4.5.1.1.2 Syntax

1H properly renders the comparative adjective construction in עַם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל רַב וְנַעֲצוּם מִמֶּנּוּ ‘and it [the nation of the Israelites] is stronger from us’ (1:9) as *et fortior nobis*, which does not follow VL (*et valent super nos*), LXX (καὶ ισχυέει ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς), or α’ (ὁστέινον, obviously based on the Hebrew נַעֲצוּם ‘bone’) syntactically or semantically.⁵⁷

4.5.1.1.3 Additions, Subtractions, and Rearranged Word Order

In Exod 1:11 1H agrees with the versions and MT against LXX and VL in reading *Piton et Ramesses* and not *Phiton, Ramessen et On* which is particularly significant because Jerome follows LXX for transliterations of proper names.⁵⁸ Verses 23–28 of Exodus 28 are absent from LXX/VL although found in the versions. Pierre Sabatier argues that Jerome saw these verses in VL because they are preserved in the ed. Compl. and the Ms. Oxon., and because Jerome’s

56 See also Exod 6:6 (לָכוּן) correcting LXX/VL βάδιδε/*vade* with *ideo*; Exod 8:3 (מִשְׁאֲרוֹת) Exod 7:28 [MT]) replacing LXX/VL κλιβάνοι/*clibani* ‘iron vessels’ with the more etymological *reliquiae ciborum*. In Exod 12:16, Jerome’s *nihil operis facietis in eis exceptis his quae ad vescendum pertinent* parallels the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר אָדָּהֶם לֹא־יַעֲשֶׂה בָהֶם כָּל־מְלָאכָה לֹא־יַעֲשֶׂה בָהֶם, whereas LXX and VL render the last phrase δσα ποιηθήσεται πάσῃ ψυχῇ. For גַּי in Exod 12:48, Jerome utilizes the political term *peregrinus* (foreign resident who is not a Roman citizen) instead of the religious term προσήλυτος in LXX. In Exod 21:33, *Cisterna* follows בּוֹר ‘well’ more than LXX/VL λάκκος/*lacus*.

57 On Aquila’s predilection for etymological renderings, see above, p. 110. For additional examples of Jerome’s rejection of the Greek syntax, see Exod 4:4, where Jerome, who usually avoids parataxis, preserves it while VL and LXX avoid parataxis with a participle; Exod 6:8, which favors the preposition *super* over LXX/VL εἰς/*in*; Exod 7:9, which has *cum dixerit* for יִדְבָּר כִּי instead of LXX Καὶ ἐὰν λαλήσῃ and VL *si*); Exod 29:43, where 1H preserves the third person passive voice of וְנִקְדַּשׁ בְּכִבְדִּי with *et sanctificabitur altare in gloria mea* unlike the first person in LXX καὶ ἀγιασθήσομαι ἐν δόξῃ μου. In the case of Exod 25:8, Jerome preserves the syntactically odd third person plural pronoun of וְשָׁכַנְתִּי בְּתוֹכָם וְעָשׂוּ לִי מִקְדָּשׁ וְשָׁכַנְתִּי בְּתוֹכָם ‘make me a sanctuary and I will dwell in them’ in his *facientque mihi sanctuarium et habitabo in medio eorum*, while LXX καὶ ποιήσεις μοι ἁγίασμα, καὶ ὀφθήσῃς ἐν ὑμῖν and VL *in quo commorari vobiscum possim* translate the problem away. It should be noted that Jerome reads וְעָשׂוּ as third person future, not as an imperative.

58 See William E. Plater and H. J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926), §§37–42.

description of the breastplate in *Epistle* 64.16 (396–97 CE) corresponds to these manuscripts.⁵⁹ However, Sabatier could be putting the cart before the horse: the fluid nature of the VL text after Jerome could have resulted in a later interpolation from IH, especially since the vocabulary in IH for these verses agrees with the wording in the letter.⁶⁰

4.5.2 *Acceptance of the Septuagint and Versions*

Even when he follows his predecessors, Jerome varies in his relationship to the semantic and syntactic renditions of the Septuagint, *Vetus Latina*, or *recentiores*. This might suggest that he does not approach his translation systematically. However, cases that reveal Jerome following the direction of the other versions but ultimately providing his own unique realization demonstrate that he draws on his predecessors as resources for his translation, not as *Vorlagen* to be capriciously copied. Under the heading of Septuagint, besides the instances where he follows the Septuagint alone, I also include those cases where the *Vetus Latina* and Septuagint agree, since the *Vetus Latina*, as a translation of the Septuagint, was understood by Jerome and his contemporaries as the transmitter of the Septuagint tradition.⁶¹ Therefore, not only is it impossible to determine whether he follows the Septuagint and *Vetus Latina* when both are identical, but it is not significant: in such cases he at least adopts the Septuagint tradition. This argument becomes clearer in contrast to the alternative situation where he follows the *Vetus Latina* where it varies from the Septuagint, for here Jerome is rejecting the Septuagint for the *Vetus Latina*. In addition to individual sections for Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, under *recentiores* I include cases where Jerome follows at least two of the later recensions of the Septuagint.

4.5.2.1 Septuagint

Semantic agreement between LXX and IH is not uncommon: Exod 1:10's פֶּן becomes μήποτε in LXX, which IH follows with *ne forte*. IH *magistri operum* for מְסִירֵי מַסִּים in Exod 1:11 follows LXX ἐπιστάται τῶν ἔργων and not σ' ἐργοδιώκται.

59 Pierre Sabatier, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae seu Vetus Italica*, Rheims, 1739–1743 (Rheims: Reginaldum Florentain, 1751).

60 Kedar-Kopfstein, "Latin Translations," 302. Additional examples include Exod 13:6, where IH and MT refer to six days of eating unleavened bread, as opposed to seven days in LXX; Exod 14:20, where Jerome's *stetit* does not follow MT/LXX וַיָּבֹא/καὶ εἰσῆλθεν; In Exod 16:14, LXX omits the phrase וַתַּעַל שְׂכַבְתָּ הַטֵּל, while Jerome's *cumque operuisset superficiem terrae*, although freer than Symmachus' *ascendit positio roris*, is also more lucid.

61 See below, p. 122.

In Exod 1:22, IH follows LXX ἄρσεν... θήλυ in rendering בֶּן/בַּת ‘son/daughter’ with the engendered terms *quicquid masculini sexus/quicquid feminei [sexus]*. Jerome’s rendering of the difficult phrase עָלֵינוּ נִקְרָה ‘[God] appeared upon us’ in Exod 3:18 as *vocavit nos* either follows the homonym עָלֵינוּ נִקְרָא ‘[God] was called upon us’ which actually appears in Exod 5:3 or LXX προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς (in both Exod 3:18 and Exod 5:3).⁶² In Exod 5:1, IH follows LXX μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσῆλθεν in rendering בָּאוּ וְאַחֵר ‘and after [they] came’ with *post haec ingressi sunt*. IH also follows LXX ἀπέσταλκεν... ἐξαποστείλον in Exod 7:16 by varying שָׁלַח... שְׁלַחְנִי () with *misit... dimitte*, although the context suggests a difference in meaning: God sends Moses to Pharaoh, while Moses asks Pharaoh to send the Israelites (i.e., free them).⁶³ Jerome parallels LXX in rendering the general term דָּבָר ‘thing’ in עַל־דְּבָר הַצִּפְרָדִּיעִים ‘Moses cried out to God on the thing of the frogs’ (Exod 8:8 MT) with the more specific “for the promise of the frogs” *pro sponsione ranarum (quam condixerat Pharaoni)* (Exod 8:12). LXX has περὶ τοῦ ὀρίσμου τῶν βατράχων, (ὡς ἐτάξατο Φαραώ), and this is an atypical rendering of דָּבָר.⁶⁴ Jerome transliterates LXX καμινιάς against VL *fornax* in rendering כִּבְשָׁן ‘oven’ (9:8) as *caminus*.⁶⁵

In some cases, Jerome follows LXX syntactically. Jerome, like LXX ἐζητεί in Exod 2:15, renders וַיִּבְקֶשׂ ‘and he sought’ with the imperfect tense, *quaerebat*, to indicate that Pharaoh was constantly seeking to kill Moses. In Exod 3:19, IH agrees with LXX ἄν μὴ μετὰ χειρὸς κραταιᾶς and VL *nisi in manu valida* in rendering the difficult הִנֵּקָה בְּיַד הַמֶּלֶךְ ‘[I know that the king of Egypt will not let

62 Even if Jerome and LXX had the same *Vorlage* that differed from MT, in adopting LXX syntax, Jerome has the same semantic result!

63 Similarly in the case of *dimiseris... inmittam* in Exod 8:21: MT (8:17) מְשַׁלַּח... מְשַׁלֵּחַ /LXX ἐξαποστέλλει... ἐπαποστέλλω.

64 According to Kedar-Kopfstein, “Vulgate as a Translation,” 79–80, Jerome often renders דָּבָר variously.

65 See also, e.g., Exod 9:28–34 where Jerome follows LXX in rendering several difficult or ambiguous Hebrew terms: Exod 9:28: וְרַב מְהִיִּת קֵלֶת ‘and there is too much thunder’, IH *desinant tonitrua*, VL *desinant fieri*, LXX πανσάσθω τοῦ γενηθῆναι; Exod 9:31: הַפְּשֵׁתָה וְהַשְׁעֵרָה ‘flax and barley’, IH *linum ergo et hordeum*, LXX τὸ δὲ λίνον καὶ ἡ κριθή and גִּבְעֵל... אֲבִיב ‘Spring...bud’, IH *virens... iam folliculos germinaret*, LXX παρεστηκυῖα... σπερματίζον (both Jerome and LXX render these nouns as deverbative adjectives); Exod 9:32: אֲפִלִּית ‘late-ripening fruit’, IH *seratina*, LXX ὄψιμα; Exod 9:34: וַיִּסָּף ‘and he continued to sin’/‘he added on sinning’, IH *auxit peccatum*, LXX προσέθετο τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν. See also Exod 10:14: מְאֹד כָּבֵד ‘very heavy’, IH *innumerabiles*, LXX πολλή σφόδρα; Exod 10:15: וַיִּחְשֶׁךְ ‘and it darkened’, IH *vastantes*, LXX ἐφθάρη (unlike α’σ’ ἐσκοτάσθη); Exod 11:7: לֹא יִחַרְצֵךְ לְבָבְךָ לְשׁוֹנוֹ ‘no dog will sharpen his tongue’, IH *non muttiet canis*, LXX οὐ γρύξει κύων τῇ γλώσσῃ αὐτοῦ, VL *mutiet lingua sua*; and Exod 12:39: עֲגֹת מִצּוֹת ‘cakes of unleavened bread’, IH *subcinericios panes azymos*, VL *subcinericia azyma*.

you go] and not with a mighty hand' adverbally with *nisi per manum validam*. In Exod 3:21, 1H follows LXX exactly in vocabulary and syntax:

MT	וְנִתַּתִּי אֶת־חַן הָעַם־הַזֶּה בְּעֵינַי מִצָּרִים וְהָיָה כִּי תֵלְכוּן לֹא תֵלְכוּן רִיקָם
1H	<i>daboque gratiam populo huic coram Aegyptiis et cum egrediemini non exhibitis vacui</i>
LXX	καὶ δώσω χάριν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ ἐναντίον τῶν Αἰγυπτίων. ὅταν δὲ ἀποτρέχητε, οὐκ ἀπελεύσεσθε κενοί.

Both 1H and LXX render the Hebrew “Egypt” as “Egyptians,” both render the Hebrew “in the eyes of” with a preposition, both employ *variatio* for “when you go/do not go,” and both render the Hebrew adverb “empty-handed” with the masculine plural adjective *vacui/κενοί*.⁶⁶

4.5.2.2 Vetus Latina

We can be certain that Jerome had the Vetus Latina as a *Vorlage*, since he initially began his biblical translation as a revision of this version. It is far more difficult to determine the precise text of the Vetus Latina available to him.⁶⁷

66 See also, e.g., Exod 3:22, which begins with “but” in both 1H *sed* and LXX *δέ* /; Exod 6:11, where *וַיִּשְׁלַח* is rendered with a purpose clause in both LXX *ἵνα ἐξαποστείλῃ* and 1H *ut dimittat*; Exod 10:8, where the awkward Hebrew passive *מִשֶּׁה אֶת מִיּוֹשֵׁב* is replaced with direct object with a generic third plural active in both LXX *καὶ ἀπέστρεψαν τὸν τε Μωϋσῆν* and 1H *revocaveruntque Moysen et Aaron*; Exod 12:21, an interesting case where Jerome's *ite tollentes* syntactically agrees with LXX *Ἀπελθόντες λάβετε* in using the participle and imperative in combination to render two Hebrew imperatives: *מִשְׁכְּבוֹ וְקַחוּ*. However, the order of the syntax is reversed as 1H has participle/imperative instead of the imperative/participle in LXX; Exod 17:3, where the common singulars *זֶה הָעֵלִיתָנִי מִמִּצְרַיִם* are replaced with the more sensible common plurals in LXX *ἡμᾶς... ἡμᾶς... ἡμῶν* and 1H *nos... nos... nostros*; Exod 22:5, where *מִיֻּטֵּב* (MT 22:4) is rendered with a superlative in LXX *βέλτιστα* and 1H *optimum*; Exod 22:18 where the masculine plural in 1H *malefici* agrees with LXX *φαρμακοί* against the feminine singular of MT 22:17 (*מכשפה*).

67 The complex textual tradition of the Vetus Latina is compounded by it being a translation of the Septuagint which has its own labyrinthine textual traditions. On the Vetus Latina's intricate history, see Kedar-Kopfstein, “Latin Translations,” 300–308 and E. Ulrich, “Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint,” in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea*, ed. N. Fernández Marcos (Madrid: Instituto Ars Montano, 1985), 68–69. Also helpful are David S. Blondheim, *Les paroles judéo-romaine et la Vetus Latina. Étude sur la rapport entre les traductions bibliques en langue romaine des Juifs au Moyen Age et les anciennes versions* (Paris: É. Champion, 1925) and Eva Schulz-Flügel, “The Latin Old Testament Tradition,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History*

Although technically a translation of the Septuagint, the Old Latin (also *Vetus Latina* and *Itala*), lacks a unified provenance, even a legendary one. It consists of various individual recensions of individual books associated with particular Christian communities in Roman antiquity. Evidence from North Africa dates these ad hoc translations to as early as the second century CE, but there were probably versions circulating in places like Italy as well. Jerome himself comments on the unregulated proliferation of Latin translations of the Greek Bible, which further problematizes the identification of his *Vetus Latina*.⁶⁸ Moreover, a distinction must be made between readings unique to the *Vetus Latina* against the Septuagint and readings identical with the Septuagint.⁶⁹

While Jerome clearly utilizes the *Vetus Latina*,⁷⁰ he does not do so slavishly. He follows the wording but not the order of the *Vetus Latina* in Exod 2:13, לִפְנֵי תִכְהָרְעֶךָ: *Vetus Latina* has *quid proximum tuum percutis* while *iuxta Hebraeos* reads *quare percutis proximum tuum*, which follows the Hebrew word order.

of its Interpretation. Vol. I: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300), ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996) 642–62. Considering as well the multiple recensions of the Greek Bible varying for individual biblical books, it is no wonder that no complete modern critical edition of the entire Latin Bible exists. This work has been undertaken by the Archabbey of Beuron, Germany which to date has produced volumes for Genesis, Ruth, Esther, and Isaiah in addition to a number of ancillary publications: *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen bibel nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der erzabtei Beuron* (Freiburg: Herder 1949–). The textual witnesses must be culled from fragmentary manuscripts, inscriptions and biblical lemmata cited by early Latin Christians. Therefore, the edition of Sabatier, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae* and the publication of individual manuscripts must be consulted for biblical books lacking a critical edition.

68 *Apud Latinos tot sint exemplaria quot codices, et unusquisque pro arbitrio suo vel addiderit vel subtraxerit quod ei visum est...* (*Praef. Jos.* 11–12). No modern critical edition of the *Vetus Latina* for Exodus exists. The text of the *Vetus Latina* must meet one of two criteria in order to be considered as the text before Jerome: either it renders the Septuagint or it is cited by one of Jerome's contemporaries (i.e., Augustine, Ambrose or, of course, Jerome himself).

69 Historical analysis based on the *Vetus Latina* is notoriously problematic. Even a *Vetus Latina* that differs from the Septuagint may actually be based on a different recension of the Septuagint. In addition, when Latin Fathers such as Jerome refer to the Septuagint, they may actually mean the Latin, not the Greek. See, e.g., J. Trebelle Barrera, "From the 'Old Latin' through the 'Old Greek' to the 'Old Hebrew' (2 Kings 10:23–25)," *Textus* 11 (1984): 17–36; Natalio Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (Leiden: Brill, 1994); and Matthew Kraus, "Hebraisms in the Old Latin version of the Bible," *VT* 53 (2003): 487–513.

70 Kedar-Kopfstein, "Vulgate as a Translation," 40–46.

Like the Vetus Latina (Latcod 100) for וּמֹשֶׁה הָיָה רֹעֶה ‘and Moses was shepherding’ (Exod 3:1) *iuxta Hebraeos* has *Moses autem pascebat* agreeing in tense and the clause connector. Perhaps the enhanced use of the clause connectors derives from the Vetus Latina which, relative to the Septuagint, employs these more often and with less ambiguity (i.e., δέ can be realized as *autem* or *igitur*).⁷¹ In the famous passage Exod 3:14, וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה וַיֹּאמֶר כֹּה, Jerome basically follows the Vetus Latina as the chart below indicates.

VL	IH
dixit autem Dominus ad Moysen	dixit Deus ad Mosen
ego sum qui sum	ego sum qui sum
et dixit	ait
sic dices filiis Israel	sic dices filiis Israhel
qui est misit me ad vos	qui est misit me ad vos

In particular, the rendering of God’s name אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה—imperfects in Hebrew, which should be subjunctive or future in other languages—does not follow the future tense of α’ and θ’ ἔσσωμαι [δς] ἔσσωμαι nor the more philosophical rendering of LXX Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν... ὁ ὢν.⁷² Although Jerome usually does not render the infinitive construct,⁷³ he does translate פָּקֹד פְּקֻדָּתִי in Exod 3:16 as *visitans visitavi*, which agrees with the Vetus Latina. It is likely that he was reluctant to alter a famous passage, but it is significant that the participle in the Vetus Latina does not follow the syntax of the adverbial dative noun in LXX ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπέσκαμμαι. In calling Moses’ staff a *virga* (Exod 4:2), he also agrees with the Vetus Latina.⁷⁴ Since Exod 12:22 contains a plant—אֶזְבִּיב ‘a bunch

71 Jerome, however, avoids parataxis even more than the Vetus Latina. See especially Kedar-Kopfstein, “Vulgate as a Translation,” 259–70 and above, chapter 3, pp. 53–54, 98–99.

72 ὁ ὢν is understand as τὸ ὢν in Philo, *Somn.* 1.230), the Platonic notion of “being” or “reality” as opposed to “becoming.”

73 Kedar-Kopfstein, “Vulgate as a Translation,” 257.

74 Only Exod 4:4 of the Vetus Latina is preserved. *Virga* is a significant choice because the term is associated with supernatural and political power. Not only can it refer to a magic wand or branch (*Aen.* 4.242, Servius on *Aen.* 4.242, and *Aen.* 6.144), it also is used by Popilius Laenas in his famous ultimatum to Antiochus IV (Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 45.12.5)

of *marjoram*'—Jerome must be following the *Vetus Latina*, since both render it *fasciculum hyssopi* 'little bundle of hyssop' (hyssop comes from LXX).⁷⁵ The *iuxta Hebraeos* corresponds to the *Vetus Latina* in rendering שלו in Exod.16:13 as *coturnix* 'quail'.

A comparison between the *Vetus Latina* and Jerome on Exod 5:22 illustrates dependence and independence. *Vetus Latina* is preserved only for part of the verse: *quare afflixisti populum hunc? et ut quid me misisti*. The *iuxta Hebraeos* reads *cur adflixisti populum istum quare misisti me*. Given the characteristic variety of Jerome's style, we can attribute the appearance of five words in common—*quare*, *afflixisti*, *populum*, *me misisti*—only to use of the *Vetus Latina*. However, *iuxta Hebraeos* does not completely parallel the *Vetus Latina*. Jerome has *cur* . . . *quare* rather than *quare* . . . *ut quid*, *istum* rather than *hunc*, asyndeton instead of *et*, and *misisti me* rather than *me misisti*.⁷⁶ In his lists of gems for the priestly breastplate (Exod 28:17–20), *lapis*, *sardius*, *topazius*, *zmaragdus*, *carbunculus*, *sapphyrus*, *iaspis*, *ligyrius*, *achates*, *amethystus*, *chrysolitus*, *onychinus*, and *berillus*, he agrees completely with the *Vetus Latina*. In sum, the *iuxta Hebraeos* may either copy or adapt the semantics and syntax of the *Vetus Latina*.

4.5.2.3 Aquila

Jerome's rendition of עָלוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם in Exod 13:18 is particularly informative because he extensively discusses the rendering of this phrase in *Epistle* 36.10–14. Damasus had requested that his protégé explain why Gen 15:14 predicts that the Israelites will leave Egypt in the fourth generation, but the Septuagint declares that the Israelites left Egypt in the fifth generation.⁷⁷ At first, Jerome ingeniously argues that the generation depended on the tribe: the Levites departed in the fourth generation while the tribe of Judah departed in

and refers to the branches surrounding the axes in the *fascies* (see LS, "fascis"). The greek ῥάβδος has a similar contextual meaning.

75 See William Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 407, who renders 'marjoram' and explains that the Septuagint renders 'hyssop' because of it sounds similar to the Hebrew.

76 While the majority of these differences do not especially affect the sense, the asyndeton rhetorically enhances the drama, while *iste* appropriately has a negative connotation.

77 The letter takes the form of *quaestiones*, *Cur deus loquitur ad Abraham, quod quarta progenie filii Israhel essent de terra Aegypti reversuri* [Gen 15:14], *et postea Moyses scribit: quinta autem progenie ascenderunt filii Israhel de terra Aegypti* [Exod 13:18]? *quod utique nisi exponatur, videtur esse contrarium*. LXX renders וַיֵּצֵאוּ אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרָיִם δὲ γενεᾷ.

the fifth generation.⁷⁸ Then, however, he defends Aquila for legitimately rendering מְשִׁימ as ‘armed’.⁷⁹ Therefore, it is no surprise that the translation of Aquila (ἐνωπλισμένοι) in the letter as *et armati* (*ascenderunt filii Israhel de terra Aegypti*) is identical to the rendition in the *iuxta Hebraeos*.⁸⁰ This may only prove that Jerome arbitrarily follows a recension when seeking the *Hebraica veritas*. In the letter, however, he explicitly argues that Aquila renders the Hebrew more accurately than the Septuagint:

I unroll the Hebrew scroll . . . and carefully paying attention I find written amusim alu bne israel mearez mesraim. The translation does not disagree in the rest of the verse. The whole conflict is over the word amusim. . . . And indeed we cannot deny that it means “five” in this language, however “five” in the plural, not “fifth” in the singular as they have translated. But the added word “generation,” which is not said in the Hebrew, is not found. . . . In truth, all Judea declares that Aquila has translated properly in this place especially.⁸¹

Aquila even follows the Hebrew more closely than σ’ ὀπλῖται and θ’ πεμπταίζοντες. Although both address the chronological problem, only Aquila’s rendition agrees with the Hebrew syntactically, for מְשִׁימ is a masculine plural passive participle. Moreover, in the letter, he notes that α’ ἐνωπλισμένοι can also be understood as *instructi* or *muniti*, so perhaps he preferred *armati* because it is semantically closer to Symmachus. At the least, however, Jerome approaches Aquila critically since he comments on the ambiguity of Aquila’s translation and follows Aquila even though he had defended the Septuagint’s version.⁸²

78 *A Caath usque ad Eleazar computantur generationes quattuor. . . . Computa a Phares usque ad Naason, invenies generationes quinque* (Epist. 36.11).

79 *Aquilam vero ut in ceteris, et in hoc maxime loco proprie transtulisse omnis Judaea conclamat* (Epist. 36.13).

80 It is, nevertheless, surprising that Jerome prefers the more Hebraic Aquila to the Septuagint, even though he had formulated a legitimate explanation (*puto problema dissolutum*) for the apparently problematic “fifth generation.”

81 *Volumen Hebraeum replico. . . et ipsos sollicitus attendens, scriptum reperio, amusim alu bne israel mearez mesraim. In reliqua parte interpretationes non discordant. Omnis pugna de verbo est amusim. . . . Et quidem quinque hoc sermone dici, negare non possumus, verum quinque plurali numero non quinta, ut illi interpretati sunt, singulari. sed nec generatio invenitur adjuncta, quae lingua hebraea non dicitur. . . . Aquilam vero . . . in hoc maxime loco proprie transtulisse omnis Judaea conclamat* (Epist. 36.13).

82 *Licet pro eo quod nos armati diximus, secundum graeci sermonis ambiguitatem, instructi, sive muniti. . . possit intelligi* (Epist. 36.12). Although Salvesen, Symmachus, 88–89,

4.5.2.4 Symmachus

Jerome's rendition *verbo signi sequentis* of לָקֹל הָאֵת הָאֶחָד 'to the voice of the last sign' in Exod 4:8 semantically agrees with σ' ἐπομένους against LXX and α' τοῦ ἐσχάτου. Similarly, he follows σ' ὑποδείξω against LXX συμβιβάσω, VL *instruam*, and α' φωτίσω by rendering יְהוֹרִיחַ in Exod 4:15 with *ostendam*. Other semantic borrowings appear in Exod 7:1—IH *ecce constitui te Deum Pharaonis* and σ' ἴδε κατέστησά σε θν Φαραώ—which also includes the syntactic parallel of rendering Pharaoh (לְפָרֹעִה) with a genitive and Exod 12:29 בְּבֵית הַבּוֹר: IH *in carcere* and σ' ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ against LXX ἐν τῷ λάκκῳ, α' and θ' ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ λάκκου] and VL *ad lacum*. Jerome's *aromata* (Exod 30:23) for בְּשָׂמִים transliterates σ' ἀρώματα. *Panes propositionis* for פָּנִים לֶחֶם in Exod 25:30 semantically agrees with σ' ἄρτους προθέσεως against LXX ἄρτους ἐνώπιους and α' ἄρτους προσώπου. Jerome also agrees with Symmachus (as well as Aquila) in syntax: both reverse the singular/plural of the nouns, for the Hebrew reads 'bread of the face(s)'. In Exod 18:5 וַיָּבֹא, both Jerome (*venit ergo*) and Symmachus (ἦλθεν οὖν) insert the same clause connector.

4.5.2.5 Theodotion

Jerome's rendering of עָרַל שְׂפָתַי 'uncircumcised in lips' (Exod 6:12) as *incircumciscus labiis* most closely imitates θ' ἀπερίτμητος τοῖς χεῖλεσιν against LXX ἄλογος, α' ἀκρόβυστος χεῖλεσιν, σ' οὐκ εἰμι καθαρὸς τῷ φθέγματι, and VL *tardi sermonis*, especially since even the morphemes are semantic equivalents (unlike Aquila).⁸³

4.5.2.6 Septuagint and *Recentiores*

The fact that any of the versions may influence the *iuxta Hebraeos* indicates that Jerome does not mechanically favor one version. Rather, a particular version reflects what he considers the best interpretation of the Hebrew.⁸⁴ Similarly, if the *iuxta Hebraeos* agrees with at least two Greek versions, this indicates that he is evaluating a particular rendition, not the version as a whole. Again, he can be motivated by semantic or syntactic considerations. The participial rendering

correctly identifies Jerome's dependence on Aquila and Symmachus, she does not discuss the evidence from the letter. For additional examples of Jerome's use of Aquila, see Exod 3:16 לְקִנְיִן יִשְׂרָאֵל: IH *seniores israhel* α' τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους against LXX τὴν γερούσιαν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ; Exod 7:14, where MT, IH and α' have asyndeton where LXX renders a purpose clause; Exod 16:36: the transliterations of IH *oephi* and α' οἰφί against LXX τῶν τριῶν μέτρων; and Exod 23:8 וְיָבִיחוּ פְקֻדֵּיכֶם: IH *excaecant prudentes* reflects the influence of α' ὀφθαλμούς σοφῶν against LXX ὀφθαλμούς βλεπόντων.

83 I.e., α=*in*, περι=*circum*, and -τμητος=*cisus*.

84 I am not claiming here that a translation close to the Hebrew is the best translation. On the declining interest in evaluating the quality of a translation, see above, pp. 26, 56–58.

of the adverbial expression בְּכֹחַ in Exod 1:13 by *inludentes* clearly comes from α' and σ' $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ as opposed to VL *cum vi* and LXX $\beta\acute{\iota}\alpha$. Similarly, Jerome agrees with α' and σ' $\lambda\omicron\iota\mu\omicron\delta\varsigma\ \beta\alpha\rho\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ against LXX $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\varsigma\ \sigma\phi\acute{o}\delta\rho\alpha$ in rendering $\text{מָאֵד כְּבֵד בְּכֹחַ}$ with *pestis valde gravis* (Exod 9:3).⁸⁵ He follows LXX $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \dots\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\iota}\ \kappa\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \dots\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \beta\rho\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\psi\eta\lambda\acute{\omega}$ and α' (SyhL): *in manu praevalenti... et in manu valida* in employing *variatio* in the rendering of $\text{בְּיָד חֲזָקָה... בְּיָד חֲזָקָה}$ 'with a strong hand' (Exod 6:1) as *per manum... fortem... et in manu robusta* and, although Jerome is closer to Aquila semantically. *Craterae* (Exod 24:6) for גִּבְעֹתֵי is a transliteration of the Septuagint, Symmachus, and Aquila, as well as being in the Vetus Latina (in the singular).

Unlike the Septuagint, which translates פִּי הַחִירִית of Exod 14:2 as $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, 1H *Phiahiroth* follows $\alpha'/\sigma'/\theta'$ $\Phi\iota\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\omega\theta$ in transliterating the phrase as a proper noun. Jerome seems to paraphrase the *recentiores*' rendition of $\text{לְקִטְרֹת הַסְּמִים}$ 'for the incense of the spices' (Exod 25:6), $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\mu\alpha\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \eta\delta\upsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ with *thymiamma boni odoris*.⁸⁶ While he employs the Septuagint in translating the materials collected to build the Tabernacle and vestments (Exod 25:4–5), he favors the *recentiores* over the Septuagint. Thus, while *hyacinthum*, *purpuram*, *coccum*, and *byssum* may be transliterations of the Septuagint, *ianthinas* transliterates the rendition of the *recentiores* not the Septuagint, and *bis tinctum* follows $\delta\iota\beta\alpha\phi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ of the *recentiores* against LXX $\delta\iota\pi\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu$. Finally, Jerome imitates the *recentiores* and Hebrew in utilizing more conjunctions than the Septuagint in these verses. It is reasonable to assume that the *recentiores* (at least Theodotion), who are not preserved here, transliterated the Hebrew *setthim*, unlike the Septuagint which translates the phrase (אַשְׁתַּחֲוִי).

Beginning at Exod 36:8, there is a radical difference in the order of chapters.⁸⁷ *Iuxta Hebraeos* follows the Masoretic Text and probably a hexaplaric Septuagint. However, it is striking that the one and a half verses absent from the *iuxta Hebraeos*, Exod 38:25–26a concerning the total amount of silver used for the Tabernacle, is present in the Septuagint. This error could be explained by homoioteleuton since 38:24 and 38:25 end with the same phrase.

85 Likewise, Jerome (*ventum urentem/ventus urens*) follows α' and σ' $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\sigma\omega\nu\alpha/\acute{o}\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\sigma\omega\nu$ against LXX in Exod 10:13 = $\alpha'\ \sigma'$ for $\text{וַיִּהְיֶה קֵץ הַיּוֹם}$ and for Exod 12:19 $\text{וַיִּהְיֶה קֵץ הַיּוֹם}$, where he has *advenae*, following α' and σ' $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\eta\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

86 The verse is actually missing from the Septuagint but preserved in the medieval corrections to a fifth century codex (designated by Wevers as Fb) which preserves hexaplaric traditions. See John William Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 7–8, 43–44. Jerome's reading of *angulos* for פְּנֵי הַיְּרֵכֹת 'its [the ark's] feet' (25:12) strangely follows Fb's $\gamma\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ rather than LXX $\kappa\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\eta$, θ' $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta$, or σ' $\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$.

87 On the discrepancy between the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text for the concluding chapters of Exodus, see Wevers, *Text History*, 119, 143–46.

4.5.3 *Critical Utilization of the Greek Tradition*

Totalizing explanations of a translator's method underdetermine the contingent character of actually translating. As Jiří Levý astutely notes:

From the point of view of the working situation of the translator at any moment of his work (that is from the pragmatic point of view), translating is a DECISION PROCESS: a series of a certain number of consecutive situations—moves, as in a game—situations imposing on the translator the necessity of choosing among a certain (and very often exactly definable number) of alternatives.⁸⁸

The alternatives from the Greek biblical tradition are definable in the case of Jerome: the Septuagint, Vetus Latina, and *recentiores*. The fact that the *iuxta Hebraeos* corresponds to different versions at different times confirms Levy's claim that translation is to be viewed pragmatically as a "decision process" at the microlevel of individual lexemes that draws on limited and definable options.⁸⁹ Thus, Jerome primarily addresses the specific words and phrases before him rather than applying an overarching principle of translation.

Reducing the relationship between *iuxta Hebraeos* and the Greek tradition to the occasional selection from one or more versions—Septuagint, Vetus Latina, and/or the *recentiores*)—overlooks an additional alternative. This decision process also involves critical comparison of the various versions. The following examples exemplifying the comparative utilization of sources should not be surprising. Before discussing the examples, let me clarify the distinction between the *use* and *critical use* of sources. In the case of the simple use of sources, Jerome adapts or copies the text in front of him. The instances examined below demonstrate another process at work: he compares the various versions and then either adapts or adopts them. That is, after he considers the versions, he evaluates them based on semantic, syntactic, and stylistic criteria. In *Epistle* 106.86, Jerome provides a glimpse of the critical process in his reading of the Septuagint: "Κοινόμια, is not pronounced with the Greek upsilon [*Κυνόμια], as the Latin translates, 'dog fly', but ought to be written with the diphthong *oi* in accordance with the Hebrew understanding, that is, every kind of fly."⁹⁰ Not only does he critique the orthography of the Septuagint, his trans-

88 Jiří Levý, "Translation as a Decision Process," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 148.

89 Ibid.

90 Κοινόμια, non, ut Latini interpretati sunt, Musca canina, dicitur per γ, Graecam litteram, sed iuxta Hebraicum intelligentiam, per διφθογῶδον debet scribi, οἰ, ut sit κοινόμια, id est, omne muscarum genus.

lation of the Hebrew in question—הַעֲרָב...הַעֲרָב ‘the swarm’, Exod 8:21 (MT 8:17)—as *omne genus muscarum... muscis diversi generis* is consistent with his analysis. This translation, however, does not simply reject the more specific LXX/σ’/VL *cynomua*. It also expands upon the more general α’ *mixturem* (Syh) and θ’ *mixturem*. The interpretation demonstrates the critical adaptation of his sources. He combines a textual emendation of the Septuagint with part of its original sense (*muscae*) with the semantics of the Masoretic Text, Aquila, and Theodotion. Unfortunately, such comments in a letter that explicitly illustrates Jerome’s critical method rarely appear in the case of the book of Exodus. Nevertheless, the textual evidence by itself can still be quite illuminating. For in some verses he only partially utilizes the versions or combines various renderings. In other verses, he follows the direction of the versions but produces his own unique rendering. This raises the question of why Jerome does not completely adopt a version’s rendition of a particular verse. Therefore, I include examples that illustrate stylistic or interpretive motivations behind the employment of the other translations. Finally, all the examples indicate a critical standard which the letter cited above suggests: Jerome measures the versions *iuxta Hebraeos*. He employs them more as guides to the *Hebraica veritas* than as sources to be mechanically copied.

In Exod 4:11, Jerome partially follows the Septuagint, even against the other versions. Like LXX ἔδωκε... ἐποίησε, IH *fecit... fabricatus est* varies the Hebrew שָׁם...שָׁם ‘set’ and renders או ‘or’ with *et* (καί) or not at all in או אֵלֶם או חֵרֶשׁ או או אֵלֶם או חֵרֶשׁ ‘mute or deaf or seeing or blind’ (*mutum et surdum videntem et caecum*). While α’, σ’, θ’, and VL have *mogilalum* ‘of stammering speech’ for אֵלֶם, IH *mutum* is much closer to the LXX δὺσκαφων. However, Jerome uniquely utilizes different words for the *variatio* (LXX has ἔδωκεν/ἐποίησεν), renders an או at the beginning of the verse with *aut* (*quis fecit os hominis aut quis fabricatus est...*), and avoids the parallelism of LXX δὺσκαφων καὶ κωφόν with *mutum et surdum*.⁹¹

He also combines versions. The rendition of אֲבִיא עַל-פְּרָעָה...יָגֵעַ ‘I will bring (one more) injury upon...’ (11:1) with *plaga tangam* (*Pharaonem...*) weaves together the Septuagint and other versions. *Plaga* corresponds to LXX πλαγχῆν ἐπάξω ἐπὶ... and VL *plagam ego induco in...*, while *tangam* corresponds to α’/σ’ ἀφῆγ. Although Aquila and Symmachus are rendering the direct object

91 Other partial influences from the versions can be found in Exod 9:4; Exod 9:22–23; Exod 12:34; Exod 13:10; Exod 18:16; Exod 19:12–13; Exod 21:8; Exod 23:7; Exod 25:4–5; Exod 25:11; Exod 31:3; Exod 32:12; and Exod 34:6–7. See Matthew Kraus, “Jerome’s Translation of the Book of Exodus *iuxta Hebraeos* in Relation to Classical, Christian, and Jewish Traditions of Interpretation” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1996) 169–70, 185, 189, 207, 209–10, 215–16, 224, 228–29, 231, 243–45, 247–48.

(נגע) as the verb by using the etymology of נגע (from the root נ.ג.נ 'touch'), they are closer to the Hebrew.⁹²

In some cases, Jerome takes his cue from the other translations and follows the direction of their interpretation of the Hebrew. For instance, Exod 18:6 is problematic because it has Jethro speaking to Moses before Jethro comes out to meet Moses in Exod 18:7. He essentially agrees with the Septuagint's resolution of this problem by adding the idea that Jethro sent word to Moses. Thus, although the Hebrew reads וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־מֹשֶׁה 'and he said to Moses', he reads *et mandavit Mosi dicens* like LXX ἀνηγγέλη δὲ Μωυσῆι λέγοντες.⁹³ However, Jerome does not follow the Septuagint exactly, but more closely adheres to the Hebrew grammar.⁹⁴

The textual evidence reveals two possible motivations for a critical reading of the Septuagint and *recentiores*. First, Jerome may rework his sources to produce a better style. Thus, he follows the Septuagint in his adverbial rendering of the Hebrew infinitive construct in Exod 8:28 לֹא־תֵרְחִיקוּ לָךְ 'far do not be far to go' (MT 8:24). However, *longius ne abeatis* is much more idiomatic in Latin than οὐ μακρὸν ἀποτενεῖτε πορευθῆναι in Greek.⁹⁵ Second, interpretive issues may be present. In the case of Exod 3:22, 1H follows LXX and σ' against VL and α' in rendering וְנִצַּלְתָּם אֶת־מִצְרַיִם 'and you shall despoil Egypt' with *spoliabitis Aegyptum*. LXX and σ' read σκυλεύσετε τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους while α' has συλήσατε and VL *praedabimini*. Aquila and Vetus Latina connote a context of the illegitimate and secret stealing of Egyptian property, while Jerome, the Septuagint, and Symmachus allude to a military context in which the legitimate and open plundering of a defeated enemy takes place. The difference between *Aegyptum* and τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους could be important, for Jerome's rendering refers to the despoiling that occurs before the Israelites leave Egypt, while the Septuagint could be referring to Egyptians who died in the Red Sea, especially since σκυλεύετε applies to the stripping of armor from the slain enemy. Thus, he both imitates and avoids the Septuagint for exegetical reasons.⁹⁶

Since the Song at the Sea (Exod 15:1–21) is completely preserved in the Vetus Latina and the Vetus Latina is quite close to the *iuxta Hebraeos*, it is useful

92 Other examples of such combinations appear in Exod 12:7; Exod 14:27; Exod 23:21; Exod 25:7; Exod 29:30; and Exod. 32:18. See Kraus, "Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus," 180, 196–97, 225, 229, 241, 245.

93 *Mando* in the sense of 'send word to' is post-Augustan ("mando," LS 11.B).

94 He keeps the active verb and Moses as the subject of *dicens*. For similar examples, see Kraus, "Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus," 155 on Exod 5:9; 176 on Exod 10:29; 180 on Exod 12:11; 205 on Exod 17:16; and 232–33 on Exod 25:29.

95 See also Kraus, "Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus," 167 on Exod 9:7.

96 See also Kraus, "Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus" 164–65, 214–16, 239 on Exod 8:16 (MT 8:12); Exod 21:6; Exod 21:7; and Exod 28:30.

to identify where the two differ in order to understand how Jerome critically employs the Vetus Latina. A schematic comparison of them on Exod 15:1 demonstrates the close similarity between the versions.

VL	IH
tunc cantavit Moyses et filii Israel	tunc cecinit Moses et filii Israhel carmen
canticum hoc Domino et dixerunt	hoc Domino et dixerunt
dicere: Cantemus Domino: gloriose enim	Cantemus Domino gloriose enim
magnificatus est, equum et ascensorem	magnificatus est equum et ascensorem
deiecit in mare	deiecit in mare.

That Jerome bases his translation on the Vetus Latina is clear not only because of the close similarity, but also because this similarity cannot simply be explained by coincidence. For example, unlike the common singular in the Hebrew (אֲשִׁירָה), Vetus Latina and *iuxta Hebraeos* have *cantemus*. Moreover, *gloriose enim magnificatus est* avoids rendering the repeated root in the Hebrew, גָּאָה גָּאָה 'for he is highly raised high'; *ascensor* is an unusual rendering of רָכָבו 'its rider' since it is from ecclesiastical Latin; and *deiecit* is not the only available translation for רָמָה 'throw'.

These similarities highlight the differences. I will discuss in chapter 5 why Jerome utilizes *cecinit* and *carmen* rather than *cantavit* and *canticum*. Let it suffice here to note that he prefers the more literary terms as well as variation.⁹⁷ In 15:2a, IH *fortitudo mea et laus mea Dominus et factus est* semantically and syntactically differs from VL *adjutor et protector factus est* with abstract nouns semantically closer to the Hebrew עֲזִי וְחִמְרָת יְהוָה וְיִהְיֶה לִּי. IH and VL are identical in the rest of the verse. In 15:3, perhaps an interpretive tradition underlies the radical difference between *Dominus quasi vir pugnator, omnipotens nomen eius* and VL *Dominus conterens bella, Dominus nomen est ei*. For the Hebrew reads יְהוָה אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה יְהוָה שְׁמוֹ 'Yahweh is a man of war, Yahweh is his name'. Not only does Jerome qualify the anthropomorphism *vir pugnator* with *quasi*, he also adds *omnipotens*, which cannot be explained as a case of *variatio* because he would hardly vary God's name. Rather than VL *electos ascensores ternos* (שְׁלֹשִׁי) *stantes demersit in rubro mari*, IH *has electi principes eius submersi sunt in mari rubro* in accordance with the word order, syntax, and semantics of the

97 See below, pp. 165–67.

Hebrew (מְבַחֵר שְׁלֵשׁוֹי טָבְעוּ בַיַּם-סוּף) in 15:4.⁹⁸ In 15:5, Jerome's *abyssi operuerunt eos* instead of VL *pelago cooperuit eos* accords with the Hebrew and א' / σ' / θ' ἄβυσσος. In 15:6, 7, 9, 10, and 16 the differences can be explained by the Hebrew and stylistic considerations. A schematic comparison of these verses remarkably demonstrates the close relationship of *iuxta Hebraeos* to the Vetus Latina as well as Jerome's departures from this text.

ו ימינך יהוה נאדרִי בַּבַּח ימינך יהוה תרעץ אויב: ז וברב גאונך תהרס קמיד תשלח חרנך
 יאכלמו פקש: ט אמר אויב ארדף אשיג אחלק שלל תמלאמו נפשי אריק חרבי תורישמו ידי:
 י נשפת ברוחך כסמו ים צללו בעופרת במים אדירים: טז תפל עליהם אימתה ופחד בגדל
 ירועד ידמו באבן עד-יעבר עמד יהוה עד-יעבר עם-זו קנתי:

	VL	IH
15:6	dextera tua domine glorificata est in virtute dextera manus tua domine confregit inimicos	dextera tua domine magnifice in fortitudine dextera tua domine percussit inimicum
15:7	et per multitudinem gloriae tuae contribulasti adversarios misisti iram tuam et comedit illos tanquam stipulam	et in multitudine gloriae tuae deposuisti adversarios meos misisti iram tuam quae devoravit eos ut stipulam
15:9	dixit inimicus persequens comprehendam partibor spolia replebo animam meam interficiam gladio meo dominabitur manus mea	dixit inimicus persequar et comprehendam; dividam spolia implebitur anima mea evaginabo gladium meum interficiet eos manus mea
15:10	misisti spiritum tuum et cooperuit eos mare descenderunt tanquam plumbum in aquam validissimam	flavit spiritus tuus et operuit eos mare submersi sunt quasi plumbum in aquis vehementibus
15:16	cecidit super eos timor et tremor magnitudine brachii tui fiant tanquam lapis donec pertranseat populus tuus domine utque dum transeat populus tuus domine hunc quem adquisisti	inruat super eos formido et pavor in magnitudine brachii tui fiant immobiles quasi lapis donec pertranseat populus tuus domine donec pertranseat populus tuus iste quem possedisti

98 *Principes* instead of *ascensores ternos* is consistent with Jerome's rejection of an etymological rendering of the same Hebrew word in Exod 14:7.

1H *fortitudo* for *virtus*, *inimicum* for *inimicos* (15:6); *persequar* for *persequens* and *evaginabo* for *interficiam* (15:9); *flavit spiritus tuus, submersi sunt, aquis vehementibus* (15:10); and *fiant immobiles*, and the repetition of *donec pertranseat* (15:16) follow the Hebrew more closely than the corresponding text of VL. Stylistic improvements semantically and syntactically closer to proper Latin usage include *percussit* for *confregit* (15:6); *in multitudine* for *per multitudinem*, *deposuisti* for *contribulasti*, *quae devoravit* for *et comedit*, and *ut* for *tanquam* (15:7); *dividam* for *partibor* and *impletebitur anima* for *replebo animam* (15:9); and *inruat* for *cecidit*, *formido et pavor* for *timor et tremor*, and *populus . . . iste quem* for *populus hunc quem* (15:16). In Exod 15:11, Jerome's more theologically correct (*quis similis tui*) *in fortibus . . . magnificus in sanctitate* against VL *in Diis . . . gloriosus in sanctis* agrees with σ' ἐν θυναστείαις . . . ἐν ἁγιάσμῳ in order to avoid any hint of polytheism.⁹⁹ In Exod 15:19, it seems that he does not follow the Vetus Latina. For instance, VL has *ascensores* where 1H has *equites*. In 15:20, Vetus Latina and *iuxta Hebraeos* are virtually identical except in one respect: VL begins with the clause connector *sumpsit autem Maria*, whereas 1H reads *sumpsit ergo Maria*. While both describe Miriam with the *tympanum* and *chori*, it should be noted that in a Latin/Greek context these objects were associated with cultic practices of women. Finally, in 15:21, the actual song that Miriam and the women sing, Jerome repeats 15:1 like the Hebrew.¹⁰⁰ Here stylistic considerations influence him. In *Epistle* 106.12, he writes:

It must be known that what is written in the Greek, "Glorify," the Latin translator renders "Extol"; following that which is said in Exodus: "Let us sing to Lord, for he is gloriously extolled." Instead of this, it is written in the Greek, "he is glorified." But if the Greek were rendered into Latin, the translation would be unseemly.¹⁰¹

99 See Salvesen, *Symmachus*, 93–94, who distinguishes Jerome's rendition from Origen's interpretation.

100 VL has *magnificatus* and *dejecit* for 15:1 but *honorificatus* and *projecit* for Exod 15:21. However, 15:21 is based on a different manuscript, and other VL versions of 15:1 have *honorificatus* to which Jerome refers in *Epist.* 22.41 and *ad Fabiol* (*Epist.* 78, *V mansio*).

101 *Sciendum quod ubicunque in Graeco scriptum est glorificate, Latinus Interpres, magnificate, transtulerit; secundum illud quod in Exodo dicitur: Cantemus Domino; gloriose enim magnificatus est: pro quo Graeco scribitur, glorificatus est sed in Latino sermone si transferatur, fit indecora translatio.*

4.6 Conclusion

The textual evidence indicates that Jerome may follow the Septuagint, *recentiores*, and Vetus Latina but also may prefer one version over another, adapt the versions or deviate from them altogether. What accounts for this apparently inconsistent application of the Greek tradition? I have claimed here that he critically analyzes his sources based on stylistic concerns (*indecora translatio*) and how they inform the Hebrew. In the next chapter, I will demonstrate how renditions reflect exegetical traditions. These three chapters on Jerome and the Hebrew and his Greek sources lay necessary groundwork for this analysis. A rendition that reflects an exegetical tradition could be based on an astute reading of the Hebrew or on a Greek textual source, not his encounter with Jewish, Christian, and Classical interpretive traditions. So a textual explanation must be ruled out before suggesting an exegetical tradition.¹⁰² Even though the textual evidence requires a more cautious approach to identifying exegetical traditions, it does refute the notion that Jerome mechanically translates from the Hebrew to the Latin. He considers various options. One of these options is exegetical tradition, or the rabbinic element in his *recentiores*-rabbinic philology.

102 To be sure, an exegetical tradition may influence Jerome's preference for a Greek version or a particular reading of the Hebrew but, without an explicit cue from Jerome, reliance on an exegetical tradition cannot be conclusively proven. Only when the textual evidence fails to explain an unusual rendition by Jerome can we securely posit his application of an interpretive tradition.

Jerome's Exegetical Translation Technique and Late Antiquity¹

The answer to “who is buried in Jerome's tomb?” is surprisingly complicated. Although his tomb is in Bethlehem, his body, more or less, lies in Rome.² One could make much postmodern hay from the fact that the Latin father of asceticism has a tomb lacking a body. I would interpret this rather complex state of affairs in a different vein, as a compelling metaphor for the study of Jerome. A good part of Hieronymian scholarship involves locating where Jerome is buried. Should he be entombed in a plethora of Palestinian Jewish traditions or should we locate him in Classical or Christian Rome?³ Or, in accordance with contemporary notions about late antiquity, does he typify the late antique individual who constantly negotiates various cultural systems—in a sense, simultaneously located in Bethlehem and Rome?⁴

- 1 This chapter is a revised and expanded version of “The Late Antique Context of Jewish Exegetical Traditions in Jerome's Targum of the Bible,” in *Midrash in Context: Proceedings of the 2004 and 2005 SBL Consultation on Midrash*, edited by Lieve Teugels and Rivka Ulmer (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2007), 17–37.
- 2 Eugene F. Rice, Jr., *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 55–59. Contrary to claims that Jerome's body rests intact in the Church of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome, several churches throughout Italy and the rest of Europe possess various parts of his body. Three places, St. Mary Magdalen in Cologne, the monastery of Cluny and the church of Nepi, lay claim to Jerome's head (Rice, *Saint Jerome*, 57, 59, 222).
- 3 Titles themselves locate Jerome in various regions of the scholarly world: Yves-Marie Duval, ed., *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1988); Francis X. Murphy, ed., *A Monument to St Jerome. Essays on some Aspects of his Life, Works and Influence* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952); Harald Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958); Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993); Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992); David S. Wiesen, *St. Jerome as a Satirist. A Study in Christian Latin Thought and Letters* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1964); Hillel Newman, “Jerome and the Jews” (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1997) (Hebrew); and Ferdinand Cavallera, *St. Jérôme: sa vie et son oeuvre* (Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum; Paris: Honoré Champion, 1922).
- 4 See above, pp. 26–32. On the fluidity of identity in late antiquity, see, for example, Peter Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity: From Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971) and *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992); G. W. Bowersock, *Hellenism in Late Antiquity*,

Numerous contemporary scholars have applied cultural studies in order to understand late antique society.⁵ Such cultural studies assume that every society has a culture, but each culture is different.⁶ Moreover, rather than existing as entities in and of themselves, cultures are constructed through language.⁷ Jerome's translation of the Bible according to the Hebrews—*iuxta Hebraeos*, the so-called Vulgate—provides such a language-based template for examining his late antique cultural context. In his letters, commentaries, and polemical works, Jerome often hypostasizes, or constructs in words, the cultural communities in which he travels. Such statements as “you are a Ciceronian not a Christian”⁸ and “we learned these things from the most educated of that [Hebrew] nation”⁹ presume a world divided into three parts: pagan, Christian, and Jewish. Jerome's discourse of distinction apparently correlates with the notion of deeply inscribed social and intellectual categories that characterize standard scholarly treatments of late antiquity. Conceptualizing late antiquity as a period of harshly delineated communities, however, grossly oversimplifies the actual fluid nature of a world in which identity was not so starkly delimited as our loudest sources like to suggest.¹⁰ For the sharp distinction between pagans, Christians, and Jews in many of our sources should be heard more as a rhetorical cry against the prevalent effacement of cultural borders. Antiochenes who went from church to synagogue had to be told by John Chrysostom that they were crossing irrevocable boundaries.¹¹

The Vulgate is a suggestive artifact of late antiquity, because, as a translation, it lacks delineated cultural borders. Jerome funnels Jewish, Classical, and Christian culture into a unified, characteristically late antique whole. To be sure, he at times conflates Jewish, Christian, and Classical traditions in his other works without highlighting his sources. Recent scholarship on his

Jerome Lectures (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999); and additional works cited in chapter 7, n. 11.

5 Dale B. Martin, “Introduction,” *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies: Gender, Asceticism, and Historiography*, ed. Dale B. Martin and Patricia Cox Miller (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 1–21.

6 *Ibid.*, 8.

7 *Ibid.*, 8, 18.

8 *Ciceronianus es, non Christianus* (Epist. 22.30).

9 *Haec ab eruditissimis gentis illius [Hebraei] didicimus* (Epist. 73.9).

10 See Richard Miles, ed., *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1999) and the numerous works on identity in late antiquity cited in chapter 7, n. 11.

11 Robert Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 148–53, 158–60.

Classical influences have noted numerous quotations from Classical literature without any introductory formulae.¹² Hillel Newman, who has collected all of Jerome's explicit references to Jewish teachings, notes that there are also numerous hidden references.¹³ The commentary on Zechariah quotes extensively from Didymus the Blind without always explicitly acknowledging his debt.¹⁴ Nevertheless, the translation of the Bible is unique because it persistently and seamlessly integrates Jewish, Christian, and Classical traditions.

This absorption of traditions should not be equated to an attempt to create an ecumenical document. Jerome unequivocally conceives of himself as a Christian producing a Christian text for a Christian church. Late antique Christians, however, simultaneously incorporated and distinguished themselves from other cultures.¹⁵ Sarah Kamin correctly claims that the *iuxta Hebraeos* had the theological purpose of establishing "a *Christian* translation for the Christian world."¹⁶ Jerome does not wish to introduce Christians to Jewish traditions but rather to eliminate the need for Christians to resort

-
- 12 Neil Adkin, "Some Features of Jerome's Compositional Technique in the Libellus de Virginitate Servanda (Epist. 22)," *Phil* 136 (1992): 234–55; Neil Adkin, "Biblia Pagana: Classical Echoes in the Vulgate," *Aug* 40.1 (2000): 77–87; and Catherine Brown Tkacz, "Labor tam utilis: The Creation of the Vulgate," *VC* 50 (1996): 42–72. The existence, purpose, and implications of such influences are matters of debate. Adkin ("Some Features," 237), for example, questions some of the Classical allusions claimed by Tkacz and attributes Classical allusions to "Jerome's own desire to dazzle at all costs. . . ." While I would not deny Jerome's proclivity towards the rhetorical flourish, with Tkacz, I do not rule out the possibility of Jerome manipulating Classical references to advance substantive interpretations.
 - 13 Newman, "Jerome and the Jews," 203. Even when Jerome cites an attribution, he rarely refers to a specific Jewish text or author but assigns the interpretation to the "Jews" or the "Hebrews" or his "Hebrew teacher." Such vague attribution should not be surprising since, as Newman demonstrates (70–74), Jerome primarily received his Jewish traditions orally.
 - 14 See Louis Doutreleau, ed., *Didyme L'Aveugle, Sur Zacharie*, 3 vols., SC 83–85 (Paris: Cerf, 1962) and the astute observations by Pierre Jay, *L'Exégèse de Saint Jérôme d'après son 'Commentaire sur Isaïe'* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985), 37.
 - 15 See, e.g., the works of Bowersock and Brown, above, n. 4.
 - 16 Sarah Kamin, "The Theological Significance of the Hebraica Veritas in Jerome's Thought," in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbruns, 1992), 249. Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 116–20 calls these ecclesiastical influences. He includes the textual influences of the Septuagint and Vetus Latina as well as Christological references as instances of Christian influence. I see more of a philological than an ecclesiastical rationale for the use of Septuagint and versions (chapter 4).

to Jewish sources in the future.¹⁷ Rather than judaizing “the Latin Christian Bible” by bringing it “close to the Jewish Bible,” he is christianizing the Torah.¹⁸ One could make the same observation about the pagan elements of the *iuxta Hebraeos*. The Vulgate christianizes Classical culture once and for all. This suggests that Jerome creates a type of Classical literature through a translation of the Bible. Therefore, Catherine Brown Tkacz rightly argues for a reading of the Vulgate as Latin literature.¹⁹ More precisely, it should be read as late antique Latin literature—reflecting a period of permeable borders among pagan, Jewish, and Christian cultures.

Acknowledging the Vulgate as a literary text engenders a whole new set of interpretive issues. Tkacz’s consideration of the work as a self-contained unit enhances our ability to understand the immediate reader reception of the Vulgate and its interpretive possibilities, but this is only part of the story. We cannot neglect the implications arising from Jerome’s rich cultural background. His translation is truly an *interpretatio* based on Jewish, Christian, and Classical traditions. Unpacking these influences enables us to understand the interpretive processes behind the composition of the Vulgate. Applying source criticism in combination with literary analysis to a translation can be a tricky business because the source text rather than profound theological or literary concerns may determine a particular reading. Therefore, I have narrowed down the analysis to renderings that have exegetical significance. To a large extent subjective, exegetical significance can be broadly limited to two categories: Latin renderings of unclear Hebrew passages and Latin renderings that include features not found in the Hebrew. Having identified exegetically significant renditions, two crucial questions emerge: what is the source of the rendition, and why does Jerome make an exegetically significant rendition in the first place? Identifying the source of the translation involves three steps. First, it must be determined whether the context of the Hebrew Bible itself

17 Kamin, “The Theological Significance,” 248 n. 21 and 249 n.23.

18 I am slightly disagreeing here with Alison Salvesen, “A Convergence of the Ways? The Judaizing of Christian Scripture by Origen and Jerome,” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed; Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 255: “So it is clear that, at various points in the formative centuries of Christian belief, while Christianity was striding off in its own direction, in the area of Old Testament Scripture it took some shuffling steps back, both towards its origins and even towards contemporary Judaism.” Jerome is not moving toward Judaism but re-moving Judaism toward Christianity.

19 Tkacz, “*Labor tam utilis*,” 42.

can account for an interpretive tradition.²⁰ After eliminating the Hebrew as a potential source, the next step is to consider whether Jerome is following one of his *Vorlagen* from the Greek tradition—the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Old Latin—which all contain interpretive traditions.²¹ When these two possibilities are eliminated, then we can posit the existence of a Jewish, Christian, and/or Classical interpretive tradition. The more difficult question is why Jerome incorporates exegetical elements in his translation. Locating the exegetical tradition within Jewish, Christian, and Classical literature provides key information for a particular tradition's rationale.

In the following two chapters, I will discuss closely selected examples from Jerome's translation of the book of Exodus. In this chapter, I focus on Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions integrated into the Vulgate, and the next chapter deals with Classical traditions. The incorporation of these traditions into the Vulgate are more often than not to be understood in relation to Christian interpretation. My goal is to go beyond parallelomania and source criticism, that is, the description of a similarity between the Latin version and a rabbinic, Christian or pagan tradition in order to identify the textual foundations of Jerome's renditions. Rather, by examining such parallels in a late antique context, we gain a glimpse at the dynamic interaction among Jewish, Christian and pagan cultures.

I should add that, while ultimately I am trying to blur the categories of Jewish, Christian and pagan, for the sake of heuristic clarity I have preserved these distinctions for this discussion. In order to understand *iuxta Hebraeos* as a whole, it is necessary to dissect it into its constituent parts and then examine how these parts come together. The focus of our discussion will be on Exodus, in part because its exegetical traditions have been underdetermined, but especially because it includes narrative, legal, and poetic sections.²²

20 See chapters 2 and 3.

21 See chapter 4.

22 The Classical tradition pays acute attention to genres, and the rabbinic corpus is distinguished by aggadic (narrative) and halakhic (legal) material. Therefore, by concentrating on the book of Exodus, it becomes possible to investigate how Jerome applies Classical and Jewish literary categories in the interpretive elements of his translation. Moreover, both the Classical and Jewish generic categories engender their own interpretive dynamic. Generic rules have long played a determinative role in the interpretation of Classical texts; see, e.g., Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994) and Albin Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature* (New York: Crowell, 1966). On the distinctive literary features and exegetical implications of aggadah and halakhah, see James Kugel and Rowan Greer, *Early Biblical Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986); Nahman Chaim Bialik's classic essay, *Halachah and Aggadah*, trans.

The following examples reflect interpretive moves traceable to references in Jewish, Christian, and Classical literature.²³ These examples can be explained neither by Jerome's *Vorlagen* nor by the context of the Hebrew. I will start, however, with a relatively simple example in order to demonstrate when we know the *iuxta Hebraeos* is drawing on a Jewish exegetical tradition and can reasonably explain why.

5.1 Possibilities and Problems

1. Exod 14:13

- MT וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָעָם אַל־תִּירְאוּ הִתִּיצְבוּ וַיֵּרֶא אֶת־יְשׁוּעַת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה לָכֶם הַיּוֹם כִּי אֲשֶׁר רְאִיתֶם אֶת־מִצְרַיִם הַיּוֹם לֹא תִסָּפּוּ לִרְאֹתָם עוֹד עַד־עוֹלָם
But Moses said to the people, "Do not be afraid, stand firm, and see the deliverance that the Lord will accomplish for you today; for the Egyptians whom you see today you shall never see again."²⁴
- IH *et ait Moses ad populum nolite timere state et videte magnalia Domini quae facturus est hodie Aegyptios enim quos nunc videtis nequaquam ultra videbitis usque in sempiternum.*
- LXX εἶπεν δὲ Μωυσῆς πρὸς τὸν λαόν· Θαρσεῖτε· στήτε καὶ ὁρᾶτε τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν ποιήσει ἡμῖν σήμερον· ὃν τρόπον γὰρ ἑωράκατε τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους σήμερον, οὐ προσθήσεσθε ἔτι ἰδεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον·

The exegetical traditions associated with Exod 14:13 have been extensively treated by James Kugel, although he does not specifically refer to the Vulgate.²⁵ It is worth paraphrasing much of Kugel while discussing this passage in order to demonstrate the interpretive elements of the *iuxta Hebraeos* as well as some of the problems involved in explaining the source and significance of these elements. Immediately before the Red Sea parts and the Israelites are miraculously saved from their Egyptian pursuers, Moses exhorts the Israelites in Exod 14:13 to behold the impending "salvation of the Lord." Although Jerome usu-

by Leon Simon (London: Education Department of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, 1944); and Isaac Heinemann, *The Methods of Aggadah*, 3rd ed. (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1970) (Hebrew).

23 Naturally, most of the Jewish and Christian traditions appear in the extensive corpus of rabbinic and patristic biblical commentaries. With some minor exceptions, we do not find biblical commentary in the Classical corpus.

24 Translations of MT from NRSV unless otherwise noted.

25 James Kugel, *The Bible as It Was* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 341–42.

ally adheres closely to the singular and plural forms of his Hebrew source text, here he renders the singular "salvation" with the plural "mighty works." The Israelites will see not a single act of salvation but a multitude of great things. Given such a minor alteration, one may well wonder, "Who was counting?" Apparently, R. Yose Ha-Gelili, a second century CE rabbi, was counting:

How can we deduce that the Egyptians suffered ten plagues in Egypt, but fifty plagues at the Red Sea? With regard to [the plagues in] Egypt, what does the text say? "And the wizards said to Pharaoh, 'It is the finger of God!'" At the Red Sea, however, what does the text say? "And God saw the mighty hand which the Lord had used against the Egyptians" [Exod 14:31]. If, by the "finger of God" they had suffered ten plagues, one might conclude that at the Red Sea [where the "hand of God" appeared] they were stricken with fifty plagues.²⁶

The mishnaic tractate Avot 5:4 takes a slightly different tack, altering the number and presenting the acts of salvation from a different vantage point: "Ten miracles were done for our ancestors in Egypt, and ten more on the Sea."²⁷ Avot presents the mighty acts not as plagues against the Egyptians but as acts of salvation on behalf of the Israelites. Such a distinction is crucial because it prevents us from tracing the Latin rendition directly to the rabbinic tradition. Rather, as Kugel has shown, the plurality of miracles on behalf of the Israelites belongs to an innerbiblical exegetical tradition. Ps 77:15–20 lists numerous natural wonders associated with the parting of the Red Sea, while Deut 11:3–4 and Neh 9:9–11 could be read as referring to "signs" and "wonders" occurring both inside and outside of Egypt.²⁸ It is worth noting that elsewhere in the *iuxta Hebraeos*, we find the uniquely Christian locution *magnalia* referring both to the plagues and the acts of salvation.²⁹ Ps 106:21–22 (Vg 105:21–22) reads: "[God] had done marvelous things in Egypt, wonders in the land of Ham, miracles at the Red

26 Cited in *ibid.*, 342 from the Passover Haggadah.

27 *Ibid.* See also Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909–38), 3:22 and 6:6–7. Some of the ten miracles include twelve paths, one for each tribe; the waters forming a vault; the water becoming transparent; the dry soil; and a stream of drinking water flowing through the split waters by which the Israelites could slake their thirst. Theodore, *Quaest. Exod.* 25 hesitantly acknowledges the tradition of the twelve paths, although he prefers the literal meaning of one large pathway.

28 Kugel, *Bible as It Was*, 341.

29 *Magnalia* is attested only in Christian authors and usually refers to divine miracles (*mirabilia, signa*): e.g., Tertullian, *Ux.* 2.7; VL Deut 1:30 (*quae fecit in vobis magnalia in terra Aegypti*); VL and Vg Deut. 11:2; Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on the Letters of Paul* on Rom 1:4;

Sea.”³⁰ In his rendition of these verses from Psalms (*iuxta Hebraeos* and *iuxta Septuaginta*) Jerome translates the “marvelous things” done in Egypt as *magnalia* ‘mighty acts’, which must refer to the plagues. He uses *magnalia* again in Exod 14:13, where it refers to the miracles at the sea.³¹ Nevertheless, although he may be following an innerbiblical tradition, the fact that *magnalia* refers to the plagues in Egypt in the Psalm and to miracles associated with the Red Sea in Exodus indicates, I would suggest, that he cleverly incorporates the two different rabbinic traditions from the Hagaddah and Mishnah Avot. That is, read intertextually, *magnalia* ‘mighty acts’ refers simultaneously to plagues inflicted upon the Egyptians and miracles performed on behalf of the Israelites.

Moreover, the connection of this tradition of numerous miracles at the Red Sea to Exod 14:13 instead of 14:31 (as in the Haggadah) may also be significant. Since 14:31 refers to the event after it happened, the miracles are unequivocally limited to a particular group (the Israelites) and place (Red Sea). By transferring the plurality of “mighty acts” to 14:13, Jerome expands the provenance of these salvific deeds to the future, to the mighty acts that God *will* perform (*videte magnalia Domini quae facturus est*).³² What might these future mighty deeds be? Already by the end of the fourth century, CE, it had become common among Christian writers to view the crossing of the Red Sea as a symbol of baptism.³³ By moving the Jewish tradition from the past tense (Exod 14:31) to the

Paulinus of Nola, Ep. 24.18; 2 Macc 3:24; Luke 1:49; Cyprian, Ep. 79.7; Jerome, *Translation of Didymus’ On the Holy Spirit* 52; Rufinus, 4.15.2.

30 Kugel, *Bible as it Was*, 342.

31 ILXX Ps 105:21 has *obliti sunt Deum qui salvavit eos qui fecit magnalia in Aegypto*. *Magnalia* corresponds exactly with the Hebrew, שְׁכָחוּ אֶל מוֹשִׁיעֵם עֲשֵׂה גְדֻלוֹת בְּמִצְרַיִם.

32 Granted that *hodie* ‘today’ limits the actions to the crossing of the Red Sea, from a strictly Latin literary point of view, the phrase is polyvalent and can be read as referring to all future events (taking *hodie* with *videte*) as well as the future events today (taking *hodie* with *facturus est*).

33 The idea that the Red Sea represents baptism—*rubrum mare significat baptismum* (Bede, *In Pentateuchum Commentarii* 91.310)—begins with 1 Cor 10:1–2 and became normative by the Middle Ages; see Brevard Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 235 and Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), who cites 1 Clement 51:5 (207); Origen, *Hom. Exod.* 5.1, 5.5. *Hom. Num.* 7.2, and *Hom. Josh.* 5.1 (401–3); Didymus the Blind, *Trin.* 2.14 (468); Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Day of Lights* (614); and the Coptic baptismal rite (696). Jerome was well aware of the typological connection between crossing the Red Sea and baptism: *Pharao cum exercitu suo nolens populum Dei exire de Aegypto in typo baptismi suffocatur* ‘Along with his army, Pharao, no longer willing to allow the people of God to leave Egypt, is choked, a typological reference to baptism’ (*Epist.* 69.6).’

future tense (14:13), Jerome exemplifies his general view that the Jewish literal reading of Scripture ignores the many concealed references to the Christian future.³⁴

2. Exod 2:3³⁵

MT	וַתִּשֶׂם בָּהּ אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד וַתִּשְׁפֹּת עַל־שֵׁפַת הַיָּאָר She put the child in it and placed it among the reeds on the bank of the river.
IH	<i>posuitque intus infantulum et exposuit eum in carecto ripae fluminis.</i>
LXX	καὶ ἐνέβαλεν τὸ παιδίον εἰς αὐτήν καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτήν εἰς τὸ ἔλος παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν.

In this passage, Jerome appropriates an interpretively rich rendition, but the presence of numerous possible sources apparently complicates an attempt to evaluate the rendition's significance. He renders the rather plain וַתִּשֶׂם 'and she set [it/him?]' with the much richer term *exposuit* 'exposed', which evokes Classical narratives of child exposure.³⁶ We can trace the use of *exposuit* to three types of sources:

1. A Latin biblical intertext such as Wis 18:5:³⁷ "They planned to kill the infant children of thy holy people, but when one child had been exposed

34 At the end of his famous letter to Eustochium on virginity (*Epist.* 22.41), Jerome connects the crossing of the Red Sea to a glorious Christian future. He includes the Song at the Sea (Exod 15:20–21) in a list of biblical texts describing the words of rejoicing sung by virgins when they join Mary to receive their eternal reward for their life of celibacy.

35 Readings from the *recentiores* are available but not for the particular verb in question.

36 See, e.g., Renate Oswald, "Aussetzungsmythen und -sagen," *DNP* 2:336–38. Jerome belongs to a long tradition of hellenizing Moses' story; see John Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972); Louis Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Moses," *JQR* 82 (1992): 285–328; 83 (1992–93): 7–50, 301–30; Louis Feldman, *Judean Antiquities* 1–4, vol. 3 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, ed. Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 186–231; and Erich Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 41–72, 128–35, 153–60.

37 Although Jerome did not translate the Wisdom of Solomon into Latin, he may have encountered it in the Old Latin: *Sapientia... apud Hebraeos nusquam est, quin et ipse stilus graecam eloquentiam redolet* (*Prol. Sal.*). See also Georg Grützmacher, *Hieronymus: Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte* (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1901–8), 2:98–100. On a pre-Hieronymian provenance for the Latin version of the Wisdom of Solomon, see Joseph Ziegler, ed. *Sapientia Salomonis*, Septuaginta 12.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 15–25.

to death and rescued . . .” (*cum cogitarent iustorum occidere infantes et uno exposito filio et liberato*)

2. A Hellenistic-Jewish text such as that by Ezekiel the Tragedian, a Hellenistic-Jewish author who rewrote the Exodus in the form of a Greek tragedy: “But when found out, she . . . exposed me.”³⁸
3. The New Testament, namely, Acts 7:21: “And when he was exposed, Pharaoh’s daughter herself adopted him.”³⁹

Since Jerome could be drawing on an innerbiblical tradition, Jewish tradition, or Christian tradition, we cannot conclusively claim that he draws on a Jewish source. We can, however, definitively characterize the *iuxta Hebraeos*’ rendering as exegetically richer than the Septuagint’s version. Not only does it have *exposuit*, it also underscores the significance of this rendition by adding a direct object not found in the Hebrew. The direct object of *exposuit* is the infant as opposed to the Septuagint, which has the basket as the direct object. Did Jerome intentionally evoke the motif of child exposure or did he simply draw on a rendition of the story from his vast knowledge of Jewish and Christian literature? I cannot explain precisely why he uses the technical term for exposure, but it does have fascinating literary implications that anticipate a modern interpretation of Moses’ infancy. Ilana Pardes has identified the story as a kind of narrative inversion of the foundling tale.⁴⁰ Rather than killing the child by exposure, the parents save the child by exposure, with Moses’ mother becoming his nursemaid. And rather than returning to kill his parents, as in the case of Oedipus, he “kills” his adopted grandfather and returns to his real parents. I doubt that Jerome intentionally inverts the Classical expectations of the exposure myth, but the reversal of such expectations correlates with Christian strategies for construction of identity—Christian myth simultaneously inscribes newness and difference by inverting the ideology and images of the pagan world.⁴¹ In short, the impossibility of identifying the exegetical

38 οὐ λαθοῦσα δὲ ὑπεξέθηκε (Ezek. Trag. 16; trans. R. G. Robertson, “Ezekiel the Tragedian: A New Translation and Introduction,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 1: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*, ed. James H. Charlesworth [ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1983], 808). Philo also uses ἐκτίθημι in *Mos.* 1.10, 11, and 12.

39 ἐκτεθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀνείλατο αὐτὸν ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραὼ καὶ ἀνέθρεψατο αὐτὸν ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν (trans. NEB).

40 Ilana Pardes, “Imagining the Birth of Ancient Israel: National Metaphors in the Bible,” in *Cultures of the Jews*, ed. David Biale (New York: Schocken, 2002), 9–41.

41 See, e.g., Janet Huskinson, “Women and Learning: Gender and Identity in Scenes of Intellectual Life on Late Roman Sarcophagi,” in *Constructing Identity in Late Antiquity*, ed. Richard Miles (London: Routledge, 1999), 190–213. Mention should also be made of

source should not deter us from underscoring the profound hermeneutical result.⁴² The next chapter includes several such examples of hermeneutical significance.

3. Exod 5:1

- MT אַחֲרַיִם מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁלַח
אֶת־עַמִּי יִחְגְּלוּ לִי בַמִּדְבָּר
Afterward Moses and Aaron went and said to Pharaoh, "Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel: Let My people go that they *may celebrate a festival* for Me in the wilderness."
- IH *post haec ingressi sunt Moses et Aaron et dixerunt Pharaoni haec dicit Dominus Deus Israhel dimitte populum meum ut sacrificet mihi in deserto.*
- LXX Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσῆλθεν Μωυσῆς καὶ Ααρων πρὸς Φαραω καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ Τάδε λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ Ἐξαπόστειλον τὸν λαόν μου, ἵνα μοι ἑορτάσωσιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

In many cases, we can trace the exegetical source to Jewish traditions, but this generates an additional question. Does Jerome draw on written texts such as Philo and Josephus or on oral traditions through his rabbinic informants?⁴³ Providing Pharaoh with a rationale for agreeing to the famous request, "Let my people go," Moses and Aaron, speaking on behalf of God, explain that the Hebrews need to engage in cultic activity in the desert. The Hebrew vaguely describes the nature of this activity as יִחְגְּלוּ 'and they [the people] will celebrate' (5:1). The *iuxta Hebraeos*, however, unlike the Greek versions, has the more specific *sacrificet* 'sacrifice', a rendition that corresponds to Philo,

François Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus: An Essay on the Representation of "the Other,"* trans. Janet Lloyd (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), a foundational work on constructing identity through the imagined Other. On Jews and Judaism as the inverted Other in the process of forming Christian identity see, e.g., Andrew S. Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004). That pagans or Jews may be used interchangeably as counter-identities should not be considered problematic because the syntax of identity formation need not be universally consistent.

42 Rather than attempting to isolate Jerome's exact source, we could take into consideration all three possibilities as mutually determinative—he wishes to capture an interpretive tradition from the wisdom of Solomon that is confirmed as classicizing by Ezekiel the Tragedian and endorsed by the New Testament.

43 On Jerome and his Jewish sources, see above, pp. 21–22.

Josephus, and b. Hag. 10b.⁴⁴ Since Jerome provides the Latin cognate for Philo's term (ἱεουργέομαι = *sacrificio*), Philo seems to be a likely source. The passage from the Talmud, however, debates whether the term in Exod 5:1 means festival or sacrifice:

[LAWS CONCERNING] FESTAL-OFFERINGS (חגיגות) [ARE AS MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR]. But they are written [in Scripture].—No it is necessary in the light of what R. Papa said to Abaye: Whence [do we know] that [the verse]: *And you shall keep it a feast to the Lord* (Lev 23:41) signifies sacrifice? Perhaps the Divine Law means: Celebrate a Festival!—If so when it is written, *That they may hold a feast unto Me in the wilderness* (Exod 5:1), would that also mean: Celebrate a festival! And should you say that it indeed means that, surely it is written: *And Moses said: "Thou must also give into our hand beasts of killing and burnt-offerings!"* (Exod 10:25) ... (Discussion about fat) ... Rather, it (that festal-offerings are sacrifices) can be deduced from [the word] 'wilderness' which occurs in two passages. Here it is written: *That they may hold a feast unto Me in the Wilderness* (Exod 5:1). And elsewhere it is written: *Did ye bring unto Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness?* (Amos 5:25). Just as in the latter verse [it means] sacrifices, so in the former [it means sacrifices. Why then does it say: AS MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR?—[Because] no inference may be drawn concerning statements of the Torah from statements of the Prophets.⁴⁵

Thus, we have a dilemma: Does Jerome rely on an oral tradition from one of his Jewish informants? Or does he follow the Judeo-Greek textual tradition? We can avoid this dilemma by addressing the correspondence between the textual variants of the *iuxta Hebraeos' Vorlagen* and the terminological discussion of the rabbinic pericope. It would also be possible that Jerome took all his sources into consideration. I can imagine the monastic biblical scholar comparing the Septuagint, Philo, and Josephus and then asking a Jewish informant to help him decide which term to utilize. With support from this Judeo-Greek exegetical tradition confirmed by rabbinic oral tradition, Jerome takes this opportunity to associate Judaism of his own time with the now defunct Temple cult. To be

44 μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ θαρροῦσιν ἤδη διαλέγεσθαι περὶ τοῦ τὸν λεῶν ἱεουργήσονται ἐκπέμψαι τῶν ὄρων· δεῖν γὰρ ἔφασκον ἐν ἐρήμῳ τὰς πατρίους θυσίας ἐπιτελεσθῆναι ... (Philo, *Mos.* 1.87); ἐξαγαγόντα μέντοι τοὺς Ἑβραίους ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου θυσίας ἐκέλευε χαριστηρίου ἀφικόμενον εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἐκτελέσαι τὸν τόπον (Josephus, *Ant.* 2.269).

45 b. Hag. 10b. Translation adapted from Soncino edition of the Talmud.

sure, such a reconstruction is speculative, even wildly so. The context of the Talmudic discussion, however, provides a compelling hermeneutic for Jerome's rendition. Not only does he exploit an opportunity to distinguish Christianity from Judaism by reinscribing Jewish sacrifice, he also validates a prophetic proof-text reluctantly applied by rabbinic exegetes. Talmudic scholars compare the use of Amos 5:25 to justify the exegesis of Exod 5:1's וַיַּחַגּוּ as 'sacrifice' rather than 'celebrate' to a mountain hanging by a hair. Jerome, in contrast, wholeheartedly embraces prophetic authority by adopting *sacrificare* as the proper translation. Affirming prophetic authority plays a prominent role in Jewish-Christian interaction. Therefore, he converts a Jewish debate about a word's meaning into an opportunity to perform Christian supersession: Christianity replaces sacrifice⁴⁶ and Christians heed the teachings of the prophets.⁴⁷ My own argument may seem like a mountain hanging by a hair. How do we know that Jerome perseverated over the translation of this verse? How do we know that the talmudic discussion had a Palestinian provenance?⁴⁸ We cannot know for certain in this case, hence the problems raised by the evidence. Yet I find it difficult to discard the passage from the Talmud that reflects the text-critical background of the passage as well as the sociohistorical context of late antiquity.

5.2 Theological Interpretations

4. Exod 1:10

MT הָבָה נִתְחַכְמָה לָּוּ פְּוִירֶיבָּה וְהָיָה כִּי־תִקְרָאנָה מִלְחָמָה וְנוֹסֶף גַּם־הוּא עַל־שָׂאִינוּ
וְנִלְחַסְבָּנוּ וְעָלָה מִן־הָאָרֶץ

Let us deal shrewdly with them, so that they may not increase; otherwise in the event of war they may join our enemies in fighting against us and rise from the ground.

IH *venite sapienter opprimamus eum ne forte multiplicetur et si ingruerit contra nos bellum addatur inimicis nostris expugnantisque nobis egrediat e terra.*

⁴⁶ See, e.g., Barn., 2:6.

⁴⁷ See, e.g., Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.* 30–53 and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.33–34.

⁴⁸ The tradition of R. Papa and Abaye qualifies as Jerome's source chronologically (fourth century) but not geographically (Babylonian). Nevertheless, the Babylonian Talmud does contain traditions with a Palestinian provenance; see Matthew Kraus, "Christian, Jews and Pagans in Dialogue: Saint Jerome on Ecclesiastes 12:1–7," *HUCA* 70–71 (1999–2000): 202–7.

- LXX δεῦτε οὖν *κατασοφισώμεθα* αὐτούς, μήποτε πληθυνθῇ καί, ἡνίκα ἂν συμβῇ
 ἡμῖν πόλεμος, προστεθήσονται καὶ οὗτοι πρὸς τοὺς ὑπεναντίους καὶ
 ἐκπολεμήσαντες ἡμᾶς ἐξελεύσονται ἐκ τῆς γῆς.
- VL *circumveniamus*

Exod 1:12

- MT כַּאֲשֶׁר יֵעָנּוּ אֹתוֹ בֶּן יִרְבֵּה וְכֵן יִפְרָץ וַיִּקְצוּ מִפְּנֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
 But the more *they were oppressed*, the more they multiplied and
 spread, so that the Egyptians came to dread the Israelites.
- IH *quantoque opprimebant eos tanto magis multiplicabantur et crescebant*

According to Theodoret of Cyrrhus, the plague of frogs was literally payback for the Israelite children drowned in the Nile.⁴⁹ A common rabbinic midrash similarly explains that just as the Egyptians threw the Israelites into the Nile, they were, in turn, drowned in the Red Sea.⁵⁰ This theme of reciprocal, poetic justice has long characterized the interpretive traditions of the Exodus story, and the *iuxta Hebraeos* is no exception.⁵¹ By repeating *opprimere* in 1:10 and 1:12, Jerome alludes to this tradition of reciprocity at the very moment when the Egyptians attempt to avoid reciprocal punishment. According to the Latin, Pharaoh and his counselors plan to “cleverly oppress” (*sapienter opprimere*) the Israelites, but the strategy precisely backfires. The more they oppress (*opprimere*) the Israelites, the more the Israelites increase. The repetition of *opprimere* in the *iuxta Hebraeos* reflects Jerome’s own interpretation because the Hebrew utilizes two different words. This is particularly striking because he often employs *variatio*. The repetition of *opprimere* underscores how Pharaoh’s plan precisely backfires.⁵² *Opprimere* certainly represents a reasonable translation of the Hebrew יָעֲנוּ ‘they afflicted’ in 1:12, but what does the word have to do with נִתְחַכְמָה ‘let us deal wisely (toward the people)’?⁵³ IH does not rely on the Greek tradition since VL has *circumveniamus* ‘let us cheat’ while LXX reads *κατασοφισώμεθα* ‘let us outwit by sophisms’. Thus, the

49 τοῦτου χάρον καὶ τοὺς βατράχους ἀνέβλυσε τὰ ὕδατα, ἀντὶ τῶν ἐν ἐκείνοις ἀποπνιγέντων ἀναδοθέντας παιδίων (Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Quaestiones in Exodum* 19); see Natalio Fernández Marcos and Angel Sáenz-Badillos, eds., *Theodoretī Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum: Editio Critica* (Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, 1979), 114–15. Theodoret continues by explaining that infants are like frogs in that they both use hands and feet for locomotion.

50 See, e.g., Tosefta Sotah 3:13 as well as Ginzberg, *Legends*, 2:341–47.

51 Kugel, *Bible as It Was*, 293–95.

52 Ibid., 288–89.

53 “נִתְחַכְמָה,” BDB 314.

unique semantic choice requires an explanation. At first glance, the Greek exegetical tradition preserved in the *catenae* provides the answer. Procopius glosses the somewhat difficult *κατασοφισώμεθα* 'let us outwit by sophisms' with *τὸ τέχνη περιελθεῖν* 'skillfully circumventing'.⁵⁴ The Greek verb is the exact etymological equivalent of VL *circumveniens*, while 'with skill' is quite similar to IH *sapienter* 'wisely'. An anonymous catena seems equally close to IH: troubled by the sense of *κατασοθισώμεθα*, it glosses the word as *βιαίως ἐπιθώμεθα αὐτοῖς* 'let us violently set upon them'.⁵⁵ Although lacking "cleverly," the Greek *ἐπιθώμεθα* etymologically and syntactically parallels Jerome's Latin *opprimamus* (and the adverb/verb construction). An even closer rendition appears in another catena: *Ἀντὶ τοῦ Μηχανῇ τινι κακώσωμεν αὐτοὺς καὶ μεθόδοις* '[the word means] Let us afflict them with some sort of contrivance and plans'.⁵⁶ In short, Jerome could be conflating the various Greek traditions in his "let us oppress them cleverly" in order to highlight the theme of reciprocal punishment.

Another word, an apparently insignificant pronoun, makes this explanation unsatisfactory. IH and MT read "let us deal wisely *with him/it*," unlike the Greek versions and the *catenae* which have "let us outwit, deceive, oppress etc., *them*." Such a rendition in the Greek is certainly reasonable since the Masoretic Text (as in the case of the Vulgate) uses the singular pronoun (him/it) to refer to the "people," a singular word in Hebrew (and Latin) with a plural sense. A rabbinic midrash, however, attributes the pronoun in question not to the Israelite people ("let us deal wisely with them") but to God ("let us deal wisely with Him").

"Let us deal wisely with him" (Exod 1:10)—it should say "with them." Rabbi Chama said in the name of Rabbi Chanina: Come let us outsmart the redeemer of Israel. How shall we punish the Israelites? If we punish them with fire, [we could be punished reciprocally] as it is written, "Lo, God will come with fire" (Isa 66:15) and "God will exact judgement with fire" (Isa 66:16). How about by the sword? But it is written "and God will judge all flesh by the sword" (Isa 66:16). Rather, let's punish them with water because the Holy and Blessed one has already sworn not to bring a flood to the world, as it is written "For these are the waters of Noah to me [which I swore never to bring again upon the earth]" (Isa 54:9). They did not know, however, that God promised not to bring the flood

54 F. Petit, ed. *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum I. Catena Sinaitica* (CCSG 2; Turnhout: Brepols, 1977), 263.

55 Petit, *Catenae Graecae*, 264.

56 Petit, *Catenae Graecae*, 263.

waters over the entire world, but God can bring a flood to one nation. (b. Sotah 11a).⁵⁷

This aggadah from the Talmud reflects a general theme developed throughout the narrative of the exodus from Egypt, the already identified notion of measure-for-measure punishment. The Egyptians cleverly attempt to circumvent this reciprocal punishment. By retaining the singular pronoun, by repeating *opprimere*, and by rendering 1:10 with 'let us oppress cleverly', Jerome alludes to a Jewish interpretive tradition. He makes this allusion because of the orientation of the midrash toward the future with its reference to future punishment. Theological references to the (Christian) future hidden in the Old Testament had long been a trope among Christian writers. Jerome was well aware of these traditions and even believed that Jews had intentionally suppressed such references when they translated the Septuagint:

The Jews say that this [changes in the Septuagint] was wisely done on purpose, lest Ptolemy, worshipper of the one God, criticize the two-fold divinity even among the Hebrews, whom he was holding in particularly high esteem because they seemed to be in accord with Platonic doctrine. So then everywhere something sacred is testified to in Scriptures concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, either they translated differently or were altogether silent, in order to satisfy the king and not divulge the secret of faith.⁵⁸

57 הבה נתחכמה לו. להם מיבעי ליה א"ר חמא ברבי חנינה: באו ונתחכם למושיעין של ישראל. במה נדונם? נדונם באש. כתיב (ישעיהו ס) כי הנה ה' באש יבא, וכתיב כי באש ה' נשפט וגו' בחרב, כתיב [(ישעיהו ס) ובחרבו את כל בשר] אלא בואו ונדונם במים, שכבר נשבע הקב"ה שאינו מביא מבול לעולם, שנאמר: (ישעיהו נד) כי מי נח זאת לי וגו', והן אינן יודעין שעל כל העולם כולו אינו מביא, אבל אל אומה אחת הוא מביא.

58 *Iudaei prudenti factum dicunt esse consilio, ne Ptolomeus, unius dei cultor, etiam apud Hebraeos duplicem divinitatem deprehenderet, quos maximi idcirco faciebat, quia in Platonis dogma cadere videbantur. Denique ubicumque sacratum aliquid Scriptura testatur de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, aut aliter interpretati sunt aut omino tacuerunt, ut et regi satisfacerent et arcanum fidei non vulgarent* (Jerome, *Prol. Pent.*). Although the rabbinic legend referred to by Jerome is extant, the specific verses specially translated do not all problematize monotheism. For a detailed discussion of the rabbinic legend, see G. Veltri, *Libraries, Translations, and 'Canonic' Texts: The Septuagint, Aquila and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement* 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 100–46.

5. Exod 4:13

MT	וְשִׁלַּחְנִי בְיָד־אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׁלַח O my Lord, please send <i>someone else</i> . [lit., send through <i>whomever you will send</i>].
IH	<i>mitte quem missurus es</i>
LXX	προχέρισαι δυνάμενον ἄλλον, ὃν ἀποστελεῖς
VL	<i>provide alium quem mittas</i>

A veiled allusion to an eschatological future, this time with Christological overtones, appears in Exod 4:13.⁵⁹ Our reluctant hero Moses, after exhausting a number of attempts to excuse himself from redeeming the Israelites on the grounds that he lacks the appropriate qualifications, finally requests that God “send, I beg you, whom you would send.” According to the Septuagint tradition, Moses begs God to send somebody else, anybody else. Pirke Rabbi Eliezer is more specific: “[Moses] said before him, ‘Master of the Universe, send whom you will send, i.e., that person whom you will send in the future.’”⁶⁰ Targum Yerushalmi leaves no doubt as to the identity of this individual. “Send on this mission of yours, Phinehas, who is worthy of being sent.”⁶¹ The *iuxta Hebraeos* reflects this Jewish tradition by using the indicative mood. It does not say “send someone else” or “send whomever you would send,” but “send the one whom you will [definitely] send.”

Whom Jerome has in mind is obvious, as we see in a fragment preserved from the Antiochene exegete, Eusebius of Emesa.⁶² He notes that “the prophet [Moses] knew who will be sent, Jesus Christ, the true savior.” Reading his version in connection with rabbinic exegesis and Eusebius of Emesa strikingly demonstrates how he incorporates a Jewish eschatological tradition into his translation. This example is particularly telling because Jews have attributed the verse to the wrong messianic figure, Phinehas.⁶³ Thus, Jerome includes a

59 There are explicit references to Jesus in Hab 3:18 (*exultabo in Deo Iesu meo*), Hab 3:13 (*cum christo tuo*), and Dan 9:26 (*et post ebdomades sexaginta duas occidetur christus*), cited by Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 119.

60 Pirke R. El. 40.

61 שלח בדון שליחותך ביד פנחס דחמי למשתלחא.

62 Ἡδεῖ γὰρ ὁ προφήτης τὸν μέλλοντα πέμπεσθαι, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν σωτῆρα τὸν ἀληθινόν (Eusebius of Emesa, in Robert Devresse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois: fragments tirés des chaînes* [StT 201; Vatican: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1959], 89).

63 An indirect chain of exegetical traditions resulted in the connection between Phinehas and messianic traditions, thereby producing his unexpected appearance in Exod 4:13. In the first century CE work *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (LAB 48.1–2), Phinehas is

messianic reference whose history of interpretation would seem to indicate that Jews were on the right track but ultimately missed the real meaning. He takes an opportunity to allow his readers to reach what to him is the correct and obvious interpretation.

Basil of Caesarea provides plausible explanations not only for why God sends Moses instead of the Christ but also for why Jerome might want to allude to the future Messiah without specifying the Christ:

That is, let the true law giver come, the able saviour, the one alone having the power to free from sins. Since the completion of the times has not yet come, and it is necessary that humanness be accustomed beforehand through types, on account of this the request of the prophet is not heeded.⁶⁴

The *iuxta Hebraeos* preserves the preparatory effect of typology. I would add another reason. Using a Jewish tradition of a messianic reference effectively responds to the pagan contention that Moses fails to mention Jesus.⁶⁵ Jerome may have felt pressure from pagans such as the emperor Julian, who writes “[Moses] never knew or clearly taught about the firstborn son of God, or God as the Word, or any of those things falsely assumed by you [Christians] later.”⁶⁶ Since the claim that Christians misinterpret Christological references in the Hebrew Bible would also have been known to Jerome, here he

identified with Elijah. The eschatological and messianic associations of Elijah subsequently adhered to Phinehas. Phinehas-Elijah, although not the messiah per se, announces the coming redemption. Since both Origen (*Comm. Jo.* 6.14) and Jerome refer to a Jewish tradition of identifying Phinehas with Elijah—*Eliam esse Phineas Hebraei ex Apocryphis persuasum habent* (PL 25.813)—we can be confident that Jerome immediately noticed the messianic implications of the targumic tradition. On Phinehas in Jewish and Christian tradition, see Samuel Krauss, “The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers,” *JQR* 5 (1893), 153–54; Ginzberg, *Legends*, 6:138, 315–16; and C. T. R. Hayward, “Phinehas-the Same is Elijah: The Origins of a Rabbinic Tradition,” *JJS* 29.1 (1978), 22–34.

64 Basil of Caesarea, *Enarrationes in Isaiam* 7.187 in Thomas C. Oden, ed., *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament. Vol. 3, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy* (Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001).

65 In identifying a specific individual with eschatological overtones, Jerome follows the direction of Targum Yerushalmi’s rendering “send now your agency through the hand of Phinehas who is fit to be sent at the end of days.” On the pagan claim that Moses does not allude to Jesus, see Gager, *Moses*, 109.

66 Πρωτότοκον δὲ υἱὸν [θεοῦ] ἢ θεὸν λόγον ἢ τι τῶν ὑφ’ ὑμῶν ὕστερον ψευδῶς συντιθέντων οὕτε ᾗδει κατ’ ἀρχὴν οὕτε ἐδίδασκε φανερώς (Julian, *Galil.* 290e; in Giancarlo Rinaldi, *Biblia Gentium: primo contributo per un indice delle citazioni, dei riferimenti e delle allusioni alla*

can rely on Jewish tradition to support a messianic reference.⁶⁷ In typical Late Antique fashion, he simultaneously differentiates pagan culture, Judaism, and Christianity while comfortably negotiating and incorporating their exegetical traditions.

6. Exod 3:2

MT וַיֵּרָא מִלְאָךְ יְהוָה אֵלָיו בְּלַבַּת־אֵשׁ מִתּוֹךְ הַסִּנֵּי

An angel of the Lord appeared to him in a blazing fire out of a bush.

IH apparuitque ei Dominus in flamma ignis de medio rubi.

LXX ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς ἐκ τοῦ βάλτου.

Exod 4:13 is not an isolated example of Christological references in IH Exodus. Jerome draws on Jewish traditions to resolve a theological problem in Exod 3:2 as well. In the famous story of Moses and the burning bush, the Hebrew Bible clearly states that an “angel of the Lord” appeared to Moses through the flame from inside the bush. Jerome, surprisingly, indicates that the Lord, not an angel of the Lord, appears to Moses. He could be making Exod 3:2 conform with Exod 3:4, where God, not an angel, speaks to Moses. The importance of this distinction was not lost on his younger contemporary Augustine because Scripture ambiguously identifies whom Moses encounters. Commenting on Exod 3:4 “The Lord called out to him from the bush,” Augustine wonders if the Lord is calling through an angel or if it is Christ appearing in the flame: “Does the Lord call through an angel? Or is the Lord that angel who is called ‘the angel of great counsel’ (Isa 9:6) and is understood to be Christ? For above it said: the angel appeared to him in the flame of fire from the bush.”⁶⁸

bibbia negli autori pagani, greci e latini, di età imperiale [Roma: Libreria Sacre Scritture, 1989], 266).

67 The Jewish interlocutors in the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature accuse Christians of inventing such references; see Gager, *Moses*, 109.

68 *Clamavit illum dominus de rubo. Dominus in angelo? An dominus angelus ille qui dictus est magni consilii angelus* (Isa 9:6) *et intellegitur Christus? Supra enim dixit: adparuit illi angelus domini in flamma ignis de rubo* (*Quaestiones et Locutiones in Heptateuchum* 3). Justin Martyr (1 *Apol.* 163, *Dial.* 59–60) reads the text Christologically when he argues that the divine being who addresses Moses from the burning bush is God the son, not God the Father; see Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 47–50. Theodoret of Cyrillus (*Quaestiones in Exodum* 5) and Severus of Antioch (Françoise Petit, ed., *La Chaîne sur L'Exode: I. Fragments de Sèvre D'Antioche* [Leuven: Peeters, 1999], 2–3) also identify the angel of God with Christ.

Augustine's query highlights the unusual character of the *iuxta Hebraeos*. Jerome's version eliminates the possibility that Christ appeared to Moses. Why did he miss an opportunity to include a Christological reference? He could be following those rabbinic readings of the verse which equate "angel of the Lord" with Lord:

From a thornbush. A Gentile asked R. Yehoshua b. Qarcha (mid-second century CE), 'Why did the Holy One see fit to speak from a thornbush?' The rabbi responded, 'if it had been from a carob tree or from a sycamore, you would have asked me the same thing. But I cannot send you forth without an answer. Why *from the thornbush*? To teach you that there is no place free from the Divine Presence, even a thornbush. . . . R. Eliezer (second century CE) said, 'just as the thornbush is the lowliest of all the trees in the world, thus was Israel the lowliest when they were down in Egypt. Therefore, the Holy One was revealed to them and redeemed them, as it is written, *and I will go down to save them from the hand of the Egyptians* (Exod 3:8).'⁶⁹

Since there is an equally prominent strand in aggadic tradition that understands the text as literally referring to an angel of the Lord, we still must explain why Jerome prefers one Jewish tradition over another.⁷⁰

A response to a pagan critique of Exod 3:2 provides a solution. This critique can be gleaned from Ambrosiaster, *Questions on the Old and New Testaments* 42:⁷¹ "Why was the angel that was sent appear to speak to Moses in a fire from a bush, on a mountain?"⁷² In a striking coincidence then, the question in Ambrosiaster almost exactly parallels the question asked by a gentile

69 Exod. Rab. 2:5; trans.H. Freedman and M. Simon, eds., *Midrash Rabbah* (London: Soncino, 1961). One could argue that Exodus Rabbah here distinguishes between the angel of the Lord *appearing* in the thornbush (Exod 3:2) and God *speaking* from the thornbush (Exod 3:4). The point of the pericope, however, depends on God, not an angel, being revealed in the thornbush, as the appearance of an angel in such a lowly setting would merit less comment. See also Pirke R. El. 40, where Exod 3:2 is a prooftext for the claim that the "the Holy One, Blessed be He, was revealed in the thornbush."

70 See, e.g., Tg. Ps.-J. on Exod 3:2.; Exod. Rab. 2:8; and Pesiq. Rab. 84.

71 On Ambrosiaster, see below, pp. 184–85.

72 *Cur angelus missus loqui ad Moysen in igne et rubo apparuit in monte?* See Giancarlo Rinaldi, *Biblia Gentium: primo contributo per un indice delle citazioni, dei riferimenti e della allusioni alla bibbia negli autori pagani, greci e latini, di età imperiale* (Rome: Libreria sacre scritture, 1989), 264.

of R. Yehoshua. The answers parallel each other as well by indicating that God can appear anywhere and that descending into the thornbush is a gracious act revealing sympathy for a suffering humanity. According to Ambrosiaster, "God is exalted; therefore deserved to appear on high, in a place which is close to the sky. . . . God made it so that he appear in a bush for the sake of sins. For he descended to give the law for the sake of sins (thorns symbolize sins)."⁷³ Since Ambrosiaster's answer begins by positing that an exalted God should appear in an exalted setting and then allegorically defends God's presence in the lowly fire and bush, the basis of the pagan critique must be the impropriety of God appearing in a lowly thornbush. Having the angel appear in the bush would be improper. In effect, then, Jerome not only agrees with Ambrosiaster's response but translates the text in a way that clarifies that God, not a messenger, appears in the fire and bush.⁷⁴ The *iuxta Hebraeos* eliminates the "middle angel" because it is the most effective response to the pagan critique, and there is a basis in Jewish exegetical traditions. Moreover, Pirke R. El. 40 also records the famous tradition that God descends into the prickly thornbush in order to emphasize divine empathy for the suffering of the Israelites.⁷⁵ Thus, from the Jewish side, the *iuxta Hebraeos* precisely supports the idea that God loves the people so much, that God is willing to appear in a lowly form—Jerome accepts the premise of the pagan critique and turns it on its head to give it a positive spin. From the Christian side, he does not counter the messianic allusion but wishes to indicate typologically that, just as God is willing to appear in the bush, so God will be willing to appear in the flesh. For Augustine,

73 Ambrosiaster, *Questions on the Old and New Testaments* 42; note that he does not distinguish between angel of the Lord and God.

74 It would not be problematic for a lesser being to be situated in a lowly bush. According to Ambrosiaster, fire is appropriate because it seeks the higher while the unconsumed thornbush symbolizes the redemption of sinners: just as the thorns are revealed but not consumed by the fire, so too does the law point out sins first before punishing them. Moreover, the thorns refer to accidental sins because a *rubus* does not have thorns on its roots.

75 "He abandoned the entire mountain, and descended into the thornbush, and He abode therein. And the thorn-bush was (an emblem of) grief and distress, and it was full of thorns and thistles. Why did he abide in the midst of the thorn-bush which was (an emblem of) grief and distress? Because He saw Israel in great grief and He also dwelt with them" (Gerald Friedlander, trans., *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezer* [London: Kegan Paul, 1916; repr., New York: Hermon, 1965], 312).

Theodoret, and Severus,⁷⁶ the burning bush actually has the Son; for Jerome, it symbolizes the possibility of the Son.⁷⁷

7. Exod 32:34

- MT וְעַתָּה לֵךְ | נְחֵם אֶת־הָעָם אֲלֵ אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתִּי לְךָ הִנֵּה מְלָאכִי יֵלֵךְ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיָבִי־ם פְּקָדֵי וּפְקָדֹתַי עֲלֵהֶם חֲטָאתָם
- Go now, lead the people where I told you. See, My angel shall go before you. But when I make an accounting, I will bring them to account for their sin.
- IH (34:1) *tu autem vade et duc populum istum quo locutus sum tibi angelus meus praecedet te ego autem in die ultionis visitabo et hoc peccatum eorum.*
- LXX νυνὶ δὲ βάδιζε κατὰβηθι καὶ ὁδηγήσον τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὃν εἶπά σοι· ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄγγελός μου προπορεύεται πρὸ προσώπου σου· ἦ δ' ἂν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκέπτωμαι, ἐπάξω ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν αὐτῶν.
- VL *ecce angelus meus antecedit te . . .*

Besides thinking about the Christological future through the Israelite past, Jerome not surprisingly imagines the end of time, the final judgment. If the eating of the forbidden fruit represented the sin par excellence for Augustine, the worship of the Golden Calf functions as the paradigmatic sin in Jewish tradition. Moses intercedes on behalf of the Israelites and begs God not to blot out this idolatrous people completely. God tells Moses to descend and lead the people with the help of a divine angel, but God promises that “I will punish their sin on the day of punishment.” Jerome’s rendition has unusual features that may be of theological significance. Rather than realize the repeated Hebrew root (“punish on the day of punishment”), he has “I will see (or punish) even this sin on the day of *vengeance*.” Although the biblical text in its original context could hardly be alluding to an apocalyptic vision of the end of days, eschatological ideas had become commonplace in late antiquity.⁷⁸ Therefore, Jerome had something very specific in mind when he used the phrase “day of vengeance.” To drive the point home further, he adds *autem* ‘however’ twice (a word not appearing in the Hebrew) which highlights the distinction between Moses (“you, however”) and God (“I, however”). Such a contrast underscores

⁷⁶ See above, n. 68.

⁷⁷ Such an allegorical reading of the bush reflects numerous interpretations of the episode. See Kugel’s application of the famous slogan, “the medium is the message” (*Bible As It Was*, 301–2).

⁷⁸ See G. Filoramo, “Eschatology,” *Encyclopaedia of the Early Church*, 1:284–86.

the dichotomy of present time and future time—now, temporarily forgiven, the Israelites are permitted to follow Moses, but God will ultimately avenge their sin.

There seems to be something special about the sin of the Golden Calf because IH also adds an *et* 'even', "I will punish *even* this sin of theirs." According to R. Isaac (second or third century CE), "You do not have any punishment which does not include 1/24 of a litra of the original Golden Calf, as it is written. *I will punish their sin on the day of punishment* (Exod 32:4)."⁷⁹ Rather than punish the Israelites at once, God distributes the punishment in tiny units through all the punishments experienced by the Israelites. Christian tradition also recognizes the uniqueness of the Golden Calf incident. According to the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the sin resulted in God canceling the covenant with Israel, while Justin and the *Apostolic Constitutions* characterize the revelation of the ceremonial law as a punishment for this heinous act of idolatry.⁸⁰ For Stephen in Acts 7:1–53, the sin of the Golden Calf is part of a long tradition of stubborn Jewish blindness, culminating in the rejection of Christ. Again, Jerome alludes to a Jewish tradition (the uniqueness of retribution for worshipping the Golden Calf) that has been more correctly understood by Christian exegetes. For Jews, punishment of this particular sin actually appears in the punishment for all sins. For Christians, the punishment for the Golden Calf typologically represents the punishment for rejecting Christ.

Numerous other examples of the incorporation of theological traditions are preserved in Christian and Jewish exegetical sources. Such examples may erroneously give the impression that Jerome's interpretive translations are always motivated by a desire to impose a Christian theological hermeneutic. Nothing could be further from the evidence.

5.3 *Historia*

8. Exod 9:24

MT	וַיְהִי בָרָד וָאֵשׁ מִתְלַקַּחַת בְּתוֹךְ הַבָּרָד The hail was very heavy—fire <i>flashing in the midst</i> of the hail.
IH	<i>et grandio et ignis inmixta pariter ferebantur.</i>

79 b. Sanh. 102a; trans. and ed. Isidore Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud* (London: Soncino, 1935–48).

80 Childs, *Book of Exodus*, 575. See also Moses Aberbach and Levy Smolar, "The Golden Calf Episode in Postbiblical Literature," *HUCA* 39 (1968): 91–116.

LXX ἦν δὲ ἡ χάλαζα, καὶ τὸ πῦρ φλογίζον ἐν τῇ χαλάζῃ
 α' συναναλαμβανόμενον
 σ' ἐνείλουμένον

For the seventh plague, rather than dispatch ordinary hail, God sends a juiced-up version, a kind of natural molotov cocktail: “and there was hail and fire was taken inside the hail.” It is unclear what exactly “fire taken inside the hail” means or how it might be possible. The *iuxta Hebraeos* “and the hail and fire, evenly mixed, were delivered” cannot be explained as a simple rendition of the Hebrew or Greek.⁸¹ Such a strange meteorological phenomenon requires the late antique commentator to draw on the resources of *historia*, a technical term common among late antique scholars. Jerome’s understanding of the term combines the Classical grammatical tradition and patristic exegesis. According to Classical grammarians, *historia* can refer to a type of content or an exegetical technique. As content, it refers to actual facts or at least a verisimilitude of actuality. As an exegetical technique, it indicates the use of realia to explicate a literary text.⁸²

This Classical grammatical understanding of *historia* becomes the lens by which Jewish traditions are evaluated by Christian scholars.⁸³ Here, then, Jerome utilizes a Jewish aggadah to explain the unusual realia of the hail. One of the earlier versions of the tradition, which can be found in a number of places, appears in Pesiq. Rab Kah. 1:4:

R. Hanin explained R. Nehemiah’s⁸⁴ “it [the hail] is like the fire of a lamp”—because the water and oil are mixed as one together (מערבין) and the flame burns from inside.

81 Aquila (συναναλαμβανόμενον) and Symmachus (ἐνείλουμένον) correctly alter the Septuagint’s rendering of מתלקחת with φλογίζον from a syntactic point of view (מתלקחת is reflexive) and a semantic point of view (מתלקחת comes from the root לקח ‘take’). Although *inmixta* could perhaps be derived from Aquila and Symmachus’ rendition of מתלקחת, *inmixta pariter* introduces a new idea.

82 David Dietz, “*Historia* in the Commentary of Servius,” *TAPA* 125 (1995): 61–97.

83 Adam Kamesar, “The Evaluation of the Narrative Aggada in Greek and Latin Patristic Literature,” *JTS* 45 (1994): 37–71. *Historia* is one of four tools—vocabulary, grammar, rhetoric, and meter—used in the interpretation of texts. Interpretation has four parts as well—proper pronunciation, establishment of the correct text, exegesis of the text, and aesthetic evaluation (Kamesar, “Evaluation,” 40). See also above, chapter 3.

84 R. Nehemiah (and R. Judah, with whom he disputes) lived in the mid second century CE.

Not only is *inmixta pariter* 'mixed equally' the semantic equivalent of מערבין כחדא 'mixed as one', it also preserves the same syntax. Jerome and R. Hanin, unlike the Hebrew, treat fire and hail as a compound subject. Donning the persona of the Classical grammarian, Jerome draws on Jewish tradition to explain an unusual phenomenon.

9. Exod 26:29

MT וְאֶת־הַקָּרָשִׁים תַּצְפֶּה זָהָב וְאֶת־טְבַעְתֵּיהֶם תַּעֲשֶׂה זָהָב בְּתַיִם לַבְּרִיחַם וְצִפִּיתָ אֶת־הַבְּרִיחַם זָהָב

Overlay the planks with gold, and make their rings of gold, as holders for the bars; and *overlay the bars with gold*.

IH *ipsasque tabulas deaurabis et fundes eis anulos aureos per quos vectes tabulata contineant quos operies lamminis aureis.*

LXX καὶ τοὺς στύλους καταχρυσώσεις χρυσίῳ καὶ τοὺς δακτυλίους ποιήσεις χρυσοῦς, εἰς οὓς εἰσάξεις τοὺς μοχλοὺς, καὶ καταχρυσώσεις τοὺς μοχλοὺς χρυσίῳ.

VL *et columnas inaurabis auro et anulos facies aereos, in quos induces feras et inaurabis auro feras.*

A significant portion of the book of Exodus recounts the description and construction of the Tabernacle along with the priestly vestments. Filled with realia, these passages demand the application of *historia* in order to make the text comprehensible to its late antique audience. Thus, for example, while the Masoretic Text requires that the bars used to connect the planks of the Tabernacle be overlaid with gold ("overlay the bars with gold"), the *iuxta Hebraeos* more specifically states, "you shall cover the bars with gold leaf," using the technical term for leaf, *lammina*.⁸⁵ Although Jerome could easily derive his explication of the realia from the context, he may be relying on a Jewish tradition which wonders exactly how the bars were overlaid with gold. However, this tradition does not require the application of gold laminate but rather indicates that two pieces of gold must be used to cover the spot where the bars traverse the planks.⁸⁶ Regardless of his source, like any good grammarian, he draws on *historia* to make the realia comprehensible to his late antique readers.

85 "lamina," LS.

86 Oztar Hamadrashim. וצפית את הברחים זהב. כיצד היה עושה היה מביא שתי פפיות של זהב ארכה של כל אחת ואחת אמה ומחצה ונותן בחללו של קרש מקום שנותנין את הברחים.

10. Exod 26:1

MT וְאֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן תַּעֲשֶׂה עֹשֶׂר יְרִיעֵת שֵׁשׁ מִשְׁזָר וְתַכְלֶת וְאַרְגָּמָן וְתִלְעָת שְׁנֵי כְרָבִים
מַעֲשֶׂה חֹשֶׁב תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם

As for the Tabernacle, make it of ten strips of cloth; make these of fine twisted linen, of blue, purple, and crimson yarns, with a design of *cherubim* worked into them.

IH *tabernaculum vero ita fiet decem cortinas de bysso retorta et hyacintho ac purpura coccoque bis tincto variatas opere plumario facies.*

LXX Καὶ τὴν σκιηνὴν ποιήσεις δέκα αὐλαίας ἐκ βύσσου κεκλωσμένης καὶ ὑακίνθου καὶ πορφύρας καὶ κοκκίνου κεκλωσμένου· *χερουβιμ* ἐργασία ὑφάντου ποιήσεις αὐτάς.

VL *et facies tabernaculum decem aulaeorum de bysso torta et hyacintho et purpura et cocco torto; Cherubim facies ea opere textoris.*

This passage is particularly significant because we have evidence from Jerome himself that explains his unique translation. Unlike the Septuagint and Old Latin, he nowhere indicates that cherubs will be depicted on the curtains of Tabernacle. Rather, he translates the Hebrew כְּרָבִים as *variatae*, “you shall make [the curtains] *varied* by the work of embroidery.” The source of his reading can be traced to a pun in the Hebrew. Since Hebrew lacks vowels, *cherubim* can be read as **c’-rabim* ‘like many’.⁸⁷ Jerome demonstrates awareness of this etymology in his *Book on the Interpretation of Hebrew Names: Cherubim*, where he indicates that it means ‘abundance of knowledge or knowledge and understanding’ (*scientiae multitudo aut scientia et intellectus*) or ‘manifold knowledge or like many’ (*scientia multiplicata vel quasi plures*).⁸⁸ Nevertheless, “varied [by the work of embroidery]” requires somewhat of a jump from “abundance of knowledge” or “like many.” Jerome, however, made that leap. While discussing the term *teraphim* (1 Kgs 19:5) in a letter he wrote to Marcella, he adds the following intriguing piece of information:

‘In *teraphim*’, however, that is, ‘in figurations’ or ‘figures’, are to be understood as varied works (*varia opera*) which are called *teraphim*. For in

87 Jerome seems to be applying *lectio* (see above chapter 3) with Jewish tradition. Tanh. Buber Gen. 25 has a similar *lectio*: לפיכך (בראשית ג כד) את הכרובים וישצן מקדם לגן עדן ויקראו כרובים שהן רבים

88 Jerome, *Opera* (CCSL 72; Turnholt: Brepols, 1958), 74, 63, probably based on Philo or Clement of Alexandria (Brown, *Vir Trilinguis*, 75). Brown suggests הכרובין *hakker* plus *rubin* ‘much knowledge’ as the source of the etymology, but Jerome, *Epist.* 29.6 (cited in the next note) connects it to the *plene* form with the *waw*.

Exodus and in other places, where clothes woven in the art of embroidery (*plumaria*) are depicted, it is said to be made as an '*opus cherubim*', that is, 'variously fashioned'. Nevertheless this is only the case when *cherubim* lacks the Hebrew letter *waw*, because whenever the word has this letter, it refers to the animals rather than the artistic work (*opera*).⁸⁹

The rendering of כרבים as a technical term associated with artisanry rather than "abundance of knowledge" has implications for his late antique audience. Augustine, in his question 107 on Exodus, keeps *cherubim* in the text but notes how the meaning "abundance of knowledge" appropriately describes the rich allegorical meaning of the parts of the Tabernacle.⁹⁰ Jerome is well aware of this allegorical tradition.⁹¹ Rather than specifically allude to this tradition by rendering כרבים as 'abundance of knowledge', he opts for the more historical rendition. Relying on Jewish erudition, he describes the appearance of the curtains. Regardless of whether his version is correct, we see here his interest in *historia* at work.

11. Exod 1:7

MT	וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל פָּרוּ וַיִּשְׁרְצוּ וַיִּרְבוּ וַיַּעֲצֻמוּ בְּמֵאֵד מְאֹד But the Israelites were fruitful and swarmed ; they multiplied and grew exceedingly strong (adapted from NRSV).
IH	<i>filii Israhel creverunt et quasi germinantes multiplicati sunt ac roborati nimis.</i>
LXX	ἡὺξήθησαν καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν καὶ χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο καὶ κατίσχυον σφόδρα
α'	ἐξήρποσαν
σ'	ἐξηρψαν
θ'	ἐξείρποσαν.

89 in *teraphim* vero, id est 'figurationibus' vel 'figuris', varia opera, quae *teraphim* vocantur, intellegi. Nam et in Exodo ceterisque locis, ubi describuntur vestes *plumaria* arte contextae, '*opus cherubim*', id est 'varium atque depictum', factum esse describitur, ita tamen, ut uau *litteram cherubim* non habeant, quia, ubicumque cum hac littera scribuntur, animalia magis quam opera significant (Jerome, *Epist.* 29.6).

90 Quod vero tam saepe dicit: *Cherubin facies ea opere textoris, quid aliud quam in his omnibus multitudinem scientiae commendat, quod interpretatur "Cherubim"*? (Augustine, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*).

91 See esp. Jerome, *Epist.* 64.

Jerome does not always rely on Hebrew sources to apply *historia* to philological problems. In language quite similar to the book of Genesis, the book of Exodus describes how the death of Joseph and his generation was followed by tremendous growth of the Israelite nation: *they were fruitful and swarmed and increased and became strong*. In Jerome's rendition of "swarmed," both the term *germinantes* 'sprouting' and the addition of *quasi* 'as if' are unique. He may be taking sides on a debate whether the Israelites increased naturally or miraculously.⁹² Rather than rejecting a theological explanation, however, he is again acting the part of the grammarian and negotiating a complex Greek textual and exegetical tradition on this passage. LXX renders "they increased and multiplied and *were streaming forth* and became exceedingly strong" (ἡὺξήθησαν καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν καὶ χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο καὶ κατίσχυνον σφόδρα σφόδρα), while for the third verb α' has ἐξήρποσαν, σ' has ἐξήρψαν and θ' has ἐξείρποσαν, all of which have the identical meaning, "they crept forth."⁹³ Later Greek commentators underscore the significance of these variants. Procopius and Theodoret⁹⁴ both discuss the precise meaning of the Septuagint's "were streaming forth." According to Procopius, "were streaming forth" highlights the numerousness of the Israelites—"it means they poured forth numerously" (χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο· τουτέστιν, εἰς πλῆθος ἐχύθησαν)—while Procopius also claims that Symmachus' rendering figuratively conveys the same idea through the metaphor of growing from the earth—"Symmachus has 'and they crept forth' as if in the case of things given forth from the earth" (ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος, ἐξείρψαν, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ γῆς ἀναδιδομένων). Theodoret testifies to a debate concerning the connotation of "were streaming forth" (χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο):

How must "they were streaming forth" be understood? It should not be taken insultingly (ὕβριστικῶς), as some have thought, but indicates their numerousness. For thus, it says, they increased, so that they might be poured forth throughout that entire land. Also, those who follow Aquila translated thusly.⁹⁵

92 Augustine, *Civ.* 4.34: *unius dei... potestate... miris modis multiplicarentur et gens illa incredibiliter cresceret*. See also Lape, *Commentaria in scripturam sacram* (Paris: Vivès, 1858–60) on Exod. 1:7.

93 Actually, Aquila and Theodotion have variants of the same form.

94 Theodoret, *Catena of Nicephorus*; see *Catena in Octateuchum et Libros Regum*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1772–73). See below, n. 95.

95 Πὼς νοητέον τὸ, χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο; Οὐχ, ὡς τινες νανοήκασιν, ὕβριστικῶς αὐτὸ τέθεικεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πλῆθος δεδήλωκεν. Οὕτως γάρ, φησὶν, ἡὺξήθησαν, ὡς κατὰ πάσης ἐκείνης ἐκχεθῆναι τῆς γῆς. Οὕτω καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀκύλαν ἡρμήνευσαν. See Frederick Field, ed., *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1964), 1:80 n. 7.

What does Theodoret mean by “insultingly” (ὕβριστικῶς)? Clement of Alexandria provides the answer: χυδαῖοι insultingly describes the Israelites as coarse and vulgar, and it is clearly a crude rhyme with Ἰουδαῖοι.⁹⁶ However, the Hebrew itself suggests another insulting connotation. “They swarmed” (וישרצו) generally refers to vermin that creep on the ground.⁹⁷ The *iuxta Hebraeos* can be understood in relation to this debate. Jerome renders the phrase “as if they were sprouting” (*quasi germinantes*). However, *quasi germinantes* clearly follows Procopius’ understanding of Symmachus—“as if in the case of thing given forth from the earth” (ὥς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ γῆς ἀναδιδόμενων)—although not Symmachus himself—“they crept forth” (ἐξεῖρψαν). Jerome continues the plant imagery with *roborati* ‘become strong’, whose etymology suggests an oak tree (*robur*). Thus, he counters the insulting (ὕβριστικῶς) interpretation from both the Hebrew and Greek direction. By adopting the new phrase, *quasi [filii Israhel] germinantes*, Jerome clearly identifies the description as a simile and, more importantly, applies a plant metaphor that precludes the negative connotation of the animal metaphor.

12. Exod 1:19

- MT ותאמרו המלדת אל-פרעה כי לא כנשים המצרית העברית כִּי־חַיִּוֹת הנה בְּטָרֶם
תבוא אלהן המלדת וילדו
- The midwives said to Pharaoh, “Because the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women: they are **vigorous**. Before the midwife can come to them, they have given birth.”
- IH quae responderunt non sunt hebraeae sicut aegyptiae mulieres ipsae enim obsetricandi habent scientiam et priusquam veniamus ad eas pariunt.
- LXX εἶπαν δὲ αἱ μαῖαι τῷ Φαραῶ Οὐχ ὥς γυναῖκες Αἰγύπτου αἱ Εβραῖαι, **τίκτουςιν γὰρ** πρὶν ἢ εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς αὐτάς τὰς μαίας· καὶ ἔτικτον.
- σ’ **μαῖαι γὰρ** εἰσι· καὶ πρὶν εἰσελθεῖν τὰς μαίας τίκτουςιν
- θ’ ὅτι ζωογονοῦσιν αὐται· διότι πρὶν εἰσελθεῖν τὰς μαίας τὰς αὐτάς τίκτουςιν.
- α’ ὅτι λοχαῖαι

Jerome again resists characterizing the Israelites as animals in the famous account of the Egyptian midwives. Pharaoh has enlisted two Egyptian

96 Ὅπῃ οὖν τινὰ ὀλίγην ὑποδείξαντες “τοῖς φιλοθεάμοσι τῆς ἀληθείας” ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τὰς θυσίας νόμου περὶ τε Ἰουδαίων τῶν χυδαίων περὶ τε τῶν αἰρέσεων μυστικῶς διακρινομένων, ὥς ἀκαθάρτων, ἀπὸ τῆς [περὶ καθαρῶν καὶ ἀκαθάρτων ζώων] θείας ἐκκλησίας, καταπαύσωμεν τὸν λόγον (Clement, *Strom.* 7.18.109.1).

97 Gen 7:21; Lev 11:29, 41–43, 46; Ezek 47:9.

midwives, Shifrah and Puah, to assist his plan to annihilate all male offspring of the Israelites. The midwives, however, disobey. Asked by Pharaoh why they have not killed the Israelites' male children, the Egyptian midwives reply, "the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women because they are *vigorous*.⁹⁸ They give birth before the midwife arrives." The term for "vigorous" (חיות) literally means "animals" and has a history of various renderings.⁹⁹ In response to this textual conundrum, Jerome employs a periphrasis and translates the single Hebrew adjective חיות 'vigorous' with the phrase "(for they) have knowledge of midwifery" (*ipsae enim obsetricandi habent scientiam*). Whence does he derive his rendering? Possibly, it reflects an interpretation of Symmachus and Theodotion found in Diodore of Tarsus:

The translation of the Septuagint seems to indicate the swiftness in giving birth of the Hebrew women, who give birth before the midwives appear. The version of Symmachus and Theodotion, however, indicates that the Hebrew women *knew the science of midwifery*, and did not need the presence of the midwives. Therefore it was easy for them to preserve the males alive.¹⁰⁰

Thus, Jerome renders not the versions but the tradition of interpretation of the versions because *obsetricandi habent scientiam* is almost an exact rendition of "they knew the knowledge of midwifery" (ἴσασι τὴν μαιευτικὴν ἐπιστήμην) for

98 "חיות," BDB 312–13.

99 LXX τίκτουςιν γάρ (πρὶν ἢ εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς αὐτάς τὰς μαῖας, καὶ ἔτικτον) not only makes the adjective into an active verb, it also makes חיות govern the πρὶν clause which really depends on καὶ ἔτικτον (since the *waw* need not be rendered with καὶ). σ' μαῖαι γάρ εἰσι· καὶ πρὶν εἰσελθεῖν τὰς μαῖας τίκτουςιν and θ' ὅτι ζωογονοῦσιν αὐταί· διότι πρὶν εἰσελθεῖν τὰς μαῖας τὰς αὐτάς τίκτουςιν follow a phrasing that differs from LXX. Since Aquila renders the phrase with the adjective ὅτι λοχαῖαι, he probably follows the phrasing of Symmachus and Theodotion. The phrasing is significant because it affects the interpretation of חיות. For if the temporal clause is subordinate to הנה חיות בני, then it makes sense only if חיות is translated as a verb. Of course, as the case of Theodotion demonstrates, a verbal rendering fits either phrasing. Jerome's phrasing with the postpositive *enim* follows σ' γάρ but only partially follows the semantics of Symmachus.

100 Ἡ τῶν Ὁ' ἐρμηνεία τὴν ταχύτητα δοκεῖ σημαίνειν τῶν Ἑβραίων γυναικῶν, τὴν κατὰ τὸ τίκτειν φθάνουσιν τὴν παρουσίαν τῶν μαίων· ἢ δὲ τοῦ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος, ὅτι αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν Ἑβραίων ἴσασι τὴν μαιευτικὴν ἐπιστήμην, καὶ τῆς τῶν μαίων παρουσίας οὐ χρῆζουσι· διὸ δὴ αὐταῖς προχωρεῖ καὶ τὸ ζωογονεῖν τοὺς ἄρρενας (Theodoret, *Catena of Nicephorus*; see *Catena in Octateuchum et Libros Regum* [Leipzig 1772–73], 557. See Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum*, 1:82). Emphasis mine.

the single Hebrew adjective. Although the verbal similarity clearly indicates that he is following the Greek exegetical tradition here, his rendition can be supported from Jewish tradition as well. Targum Onkelos renders **כי חיות הגה** with **ארי חכמין אנן** 'for they (f.) are wise', while Targum Yerushalmi has **ארום זריזין וחכמין בדעתיהן הינן** 'for they were quick and wise in their knowledge'.¹⁰¹ This targumic tradition correlates with an aggadic tradition found in the Talmud which concludes that the Israelites were similar to animals rather than actually animals.¹⁰² In addition, the expansive version of Targum Yerushalmi goes on to explain that they were quick and wise in the sense that they "lifted their eyes in prayer and prayed and sought mercy before their Father in heaven and He heard the call of their prayer and immediately they were answered and gave birth and were redeemed in peace." This Targum's interpretation coincidentally corresponds with the view of Jerome's contemporary Ambrose:

Indeed, in regard to other Hebrew women you find it written that the Hebrew women give birth before the midwives arrive. This is so because the souls of the just do not wait upon branches of learning arranged according to kinds of knowledge, nor do they require assistance in parturition, but they bring forth their offspring spontaneously and anticipate the expected time.¹⁰³

Both the Targum and Ambrose attribute the Israelite women's success against Pharaoh to their piety, not any skill on their part. Jerome categorically rejects this view by having the midwives claim that Hebrew women did "rely on the branches of learning." His rendition becomes clearer when read in its late antique context.

13. **Exod 15:1**

MT **אז יִשְׂרָאֵל־מִשָּׁה וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַשִּׁירָה הַזֹּאת לַיהוָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ לֵאמֹר אֲשִׁירָה לַיהוָה כִּי־גָאָה גָּאָה**

Then Moses and the Israelites sang this song to the Lord. They said: I will sing to the Lord, for He has triumphed gloriously.

¹⁰¹ The Targum could have influenced the Antiochene tradition.

¹⁰² b Sotah 11b.

ותאמרן המילדות אלא אמרו לו אל פרעה כי לא כנשים וגו' מאי חיות? אילמא חיות ממש אטו (שמות א) חיה מי לא צריכה חיה אחריתי לאולודה? אומה זו כחיה נמסלה. יהודה— (בראשית מט) גור אריה. דן יהי דן נחש. נפתלי—אילה שלוחה.

¹⁰³ Ambrose, *Fug.* in *ACCS* 3:4.

- IH *tunc cecinit Moses et filii Israhel carmen hoc Domino et dixerunt cantemus Domino gloriose enim magnificatus est.*
- LXX Τότε ᾤσεν Μωυσῆς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν ᾠδὴν ταύτην τῷ θεῷ καὶ εἶπαν λέγοντες ᾠσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ, ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται·
- VL *tunc cantavit Moyses et filii Israel canticum hoc Domino et dixerunt dicere: Cantemus Domino: gloriose enim magnificatus est.*

As an exegete in the Classical tradition, Jerome would be sensitive to issues of genre. Therefore, we would expect him to show interest in the proper classification of the Song at the Sea. The Hebrew, repeating the root for “song” three times, clearly identifies the genre, but the biblical understanding of a song or poem differs from Classical literary theory.¹⁰⁴ At first glance, the *iuxta Hebraeos* does not seem remarkable. That the Old Latin is the basis for the translation is clear not only because of the close similarity between the two texts for the entire song, but also because this similarity cannot simply be explained by coincidence.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, the fact that Jerome uses *cecinit* and *carmen* rather than *cantavit* and *canticum* becomes significant. Although *canere* and *cantare* are similar, *canere* belongs to more exalted poetic utterances while *cantare* refers to the activity of singers or actors. Thus, *canere* much more appropriately introduce a poem celebrating national deliverance. The same applies to *carmen* and *canticum*: *canticum* refers to a song in Roman comedy or a lampoon or incantation whereas *carmen* refers to the more lofty lyric or epic poetry or prophecy.¹⁰⁶ Here Jerome would be following Josephus’ claim that Moses composed the poem in hexameters—in other words, epic verse.¹⁰⁷

The use of *canere* is especially striking. The late antique pagan grammarian Servius, who may have even studied with Jerome,¹⁰⁸ states in his commentary on the opening of the *Aeneid* that *canere* refers to three actions: praise (*laudare*), predicting the future (*divinare*), and the physical act of singing

104 Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York: Basic Books, 1985) and Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).

105 See above, pp. 130–34.

106 See “*carmen*,” LS, and “*canticum*,” LS. Jerome also may be influenced by LXX (ᾤσεν) . . . τὴν ᾠδὴν.

107 Μωυσῆς ᾠδὴν εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἐγκώμιόν τε καὶ τῆς εὐμενείας εὐχαριστίαν περιέχουσαν ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ συντίθησιν (Josephus, *Ant.* 2.346).

108 Both Jerome and Servius were pupils of the Aelius Donatus. See Louis Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IV^e–IX^e siècle et édition critique* (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1981).

(cantare).¹⁰⁹ In a comment on Eclogues 7.5 (*et cantare pares et respondere parati*), Servius refines the possible senses of *cantare* by delineating two types of singing. He explains that *cantare* can refer to the recitation of a continuous poem (*continuum carmen*) or the responsive performance characteristic of the amoebaeic song.¹¹⁰ Since Miriam antiphonally responds to Moses' song, the *iuxta Hebraeos* captures all the aspects of *canere*'s meaning in a late antique context. Let me boldly suggest that Jerome drew upon his Classical grammatical education here because this technical late antique Latin terminology correlates with rabbinic interpretation. The Mekhilta's exegesis of Exod 15:1 includes the three possible meanings for "song" as well:

Then Sang Moses: Sometimes "then" refers to what is past, and sometimes "then" refers to what will come *in the future*. . . . *And they spoke, Saying:* Rabbi Nehemiah says: The Holy Spirit Came to rest on Israel, and they recited the Song like people reciting the Shema. Rabbi Akiba says: The Holy Spirit came to rest upon them and they recited the Song like people reciting the *Hallel* [songs of praise]. Rabbi Eliezer ben Taddai says: First Moses *would begin a sentence and then Israel would repeat after him*.¹¹¹

As in Servius, the song refers to the future, it is a form of praise, and it is a particular type of antiphonal singing. Jerome translates Jewish tradition into the language of late antique grammarians.

Having said that, we should not make the mistake of concluding that Classical and rabbinic technical terms for "song" and "singing" have precisely the same connotations in the *iuxta Hebraeos*. For example, it should be obvious to us that Jerome would be imagining a future very different than the future conceived by Vergil or the Mekilta. In a sense, *historia* and theology intersect in the *iuxta Hebraeos*.

109 *Cano polysemus sermo est. tria enim significat: aliquando laudo, ut "regemque canebant" (Aen. 7.698); aliquando divino, ut "ipsa canas oro" (Aen. 6.76); aliquando canto, ut in hoc loco. nam proprie canto significat, quia cantanda sunt carmina* (Servius on Aen. 1.1).

110 *Et cantare pares et r. p. hoc est qui possent et continuum carmen dicere-nam hoc est cantare, ut extinctum nymphae crudeli funere Daphnim, vel "candidus insuetum miratur lumen Olympi"-et amoebaeum referre, ut "et me Phoebus amat, Phoebus sua semper apud me munera sunt lauri"* (Servius on Ecl. 7.5).

111 Translation from Judah Goldin, *The Song of the Sea* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), 65, 77–78 (emphasis added). Granted that the Mekhilta takes *ṭān* 'then' as its starting point, the exegesis is still closely associated with Moses' singing.

5.4 Legal Exegesis

Contemporary scholars have noted that the exegesis of legal texts generates its own particular set of problems.¹¹² Because laws have immediate application, the terms of the legislation must be precise. Moreover, since a law cannot anticipate all possible scenarios, legal texts are constantly being interpreted and reinterpreted based on the messiness of human experience. The following examples typify the issues raised by legal texts. Jerome resolves such exegetical problems by drawing on his Classical, Christian, and Jewish resources.

14. Exod 20:14

MT (20:17)	לֹא תַחְמַד בֵּית רֵעֶךָ לֹא־תַחְמַד אִשְׁתּוֹ רֵעֶךָ You shall not covet your neighbor's house: you shall not covet your neighbor's wife.
IH	<i>non concupisces domum proximi tui nec desiderabis uxorem eius.</i>
LXX	οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου. οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ πλησίον σου
VL	<i>non concupisces uxorem proximi tui; non concupisces domum proximi tui.</i>

The tenth commandment, “you shall not covet,” has often struck modern commentators as unusual because it legislates against a feeling, not an action.¹¹³ Nonetheless, the language of law must be precise, so it is surprising that Jerome varies the Hebrew. Although the Hebrew and Septuagint repeat the command—“you shall not covet the house of your neighbor,” “you shall not covet the wife of your neighbor”—he renders the first phrase with *non concupisces* ‘you shall not covet’ and the second phrase with the synonymous *nec desiderabis* ‘you shall not desire’. Jerome does like to vary the diction but not in legal materials. Rather, the variation reflects a discussion about the precise meaning of *concupiscentia*. In *Epistle* 121.8, he draws on Cicero rather than

¹¹² Kugel and Greer, *Early Biblical Interpretation*, 31–33, 90–96; Menahem Elon, “Interpretation,” in *The Principles of Jewish Law*, ed. Menahem Elon (Jerusalem: Keter, 1975), 57–73; Peretz Segal, “Jewish Law During the Tannaitic Period” in *An Introduction to the History and Sources of Jewish Law*, ed. N. S. Hecht, et al. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 106–14; and “Intepretatio,” *DNP*, 1038–1041.

¹¹³ William Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 180. It may have struck ancient readers as well. According to Pesiqa Rabbati 21.14, “you shall not covet” contains all ten of the commandments.

Exodus to explain Paul's reference to the tenth commandment in his epistle to the Romans:¹¹⁴

First we ask what is that coveting (*concupiscentia*) concerning which the law says, "you shall not covet" (Rom 7:7). Some think that which is in the decalogue has been commanded, "you shall not covet the property of your neighbor" (Exod 20:14). We, however, think that all [four] passions of the soul are meant through the term *concupiscentia* by which we experience sorrow, feel pain, fear, and desire.¹¹⁵

Thus, in the process of explaining Paul, Jerome distinguishes the Classical interpretation of coveting from its sense in Exod 20:14. His translation of the commandment in Exodus 20 reflects his view that the Ciceronian understanding of *concupiscentia* does not apply to the decalogue. By glossing "you shall not covet" with "you shall not desire" in Exod 20:14, he makes clear that Exodus prohibits only coveting, not any other passion (such as sorrow, feeling pain or fear).¹¹⁶ This correlates with Jewish tradition, for Rabbi Judah Hanasi (third century) taught:

114 See Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers*, 331–46. Hagendahl (332) demonstrates that Jerome derives the concept of the four *perturbationes* from Cicero (*Tusc. Disp.* 4.11). Since Jerome discusses the precise meaning of the commandment in connection with Classical traditions about the four *perturbationes* 'emotions', the *variatio* could actually be understood as a rejection of the Classical interpretation (On the *perturbationes* as the Ciceronian term instead of *passiones*, see Aline Canellis, "Saint Jérôme et les passions: sur les quattuor perturbationes des Tusculanes," *VC* 54 [2000], 178–203).

115 *Prius quaerimus, quae sit ista concupiscentia, de qua lex dicit: 'Non concupisces' (Rom 7:7). Alii putant illud esse mandatum, quod in decalogo scriptum est: 'Non concupisces rem proximi tui' (Exod 20:17). Nos autem per concupiscentiam omnes perturbationes animae significatas putamus, quibus maeremus et dolemus, timemus et concupiscebimus.*

116 Although the conceit of four *perturbationes* applies to Jerome's interpretation of the passage from Romans with *autem nos* (above n. 114), he explicitly differentiates the sense of the Exodus passage from the Ciceronian definition of *concupiscentia*. In effect, then, the tenth commandment does not refer to *perturbationes*. Jerome reinforces his opinion through the *variatio* which deemphasizes the technical philosophical vocabulary; Canellis, "Saint Jérôme," 181, notes that Jerome does not always apply terminology for "passions" and "emotions" consistently. In contrast, the *Vetus Latina* repeats *concupiscis*. The context of Rom 7:7 also accounts for the disassociation from the Exodus passage. E.g., Rom 7:6 contrasts the obedience to the *novitas spiritus* instead of the *vetustas litterae*, i.e., the spiritual versus the written law. Nevertheless, Canellis (182) cites a clear case of Ciceronian influence in Jerome's *Comm. Gal.* 3.5, 22, where both *desiderium* and *cupiditas* are classified as synonymous terms for one of the *perturbationes*: *non solum autem in*

One text (Exod 20:14) says “you shall not covet” and one text (Deut 5:21) says “you shall not desire” (לֹא תַחְמוֹד) How can these two scriptural verses exist [without contradicting each other]? The latter is a warning against seeking an opportunity against the adulterer.¹¹⁷

Attempting to harmonize the repetition of the ten commandments in Deuteronomy, Rabbi Judah Hanasi indicates that the different word in Deuteronomy functions as a clarification of the wording in Exodus. Jerome similarly refines *concupiscas* with *desiderabis*. Rather than import the Pauline (and Ciceronian) meaning into Exodus, he preserves the more restricted sense of “you shall not covet.” In effect, then, Paul has improved upon the Old Testament by properly expanding the sense of the ancient biblical law. As a result, Jerome ultimately allows the Christian interpretation of Paul to trump the Jewish exegesis of Rabbi Judah Hanasi.

15. Exod 21:22–25

MT כִּי־יִנָּצוּ אָנָשִׁים וְנָגְפוּ אִשָּׁה הָרָה וַיָּצְאוּ יַלְדֶּיהָ וְלֹא יִהְיֶה אָסוֹן עָנֹשׁ יַעֲנֹשׁ כְּאִשָּׁר
יִשִּׁית עָלָיו בְּעַל הָאִשָּׁה וְנָתַן בַּפְּלִלִים

When people who are fighting injure a pregnant woman *so that* there is a *miscarriage*, and yet no further harm follows, the one responsible shall be fined what the woman’s husband demands, paying as much as *the judges determine*.¹¹⁸

IH *si rixati fuerint viri et percusserit quis mulierem praegnantem et abortivum quidem fecerit sed ipsa vixerit subiacebit damno quantum expetierit maritus mulieris et arbitri iudicarint.*

LXX ἐὰν δὲ μάχωνται δύο ἄνδρες καὶ πατάξωσιν γυναῖκα ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσσαν, καὶ ἐξέλθῃ τὸ παιδίον αὐτῆς μὴ ἐξεικονισμένον, ἐπιζήμιον ζημιωθήσεται· αἰθεότι ἂν ἐπιβάλῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ τῆς γυναίκος, δώσει μετὰ ἀξιώματος·

VL *si autem litigabunt duo viri et percusserint mulierem in utero habentem, et exierit infans eius nondum formatus; detrimentum patietur, quantum indixerit vir mulieris, et dabit cum postulatione.*

desideriis et cupiditate, continentia necessaria est, sed etiam in tribus reliquis perturbationibus, dolore scilicet, laetitia et timore ‘not only, however, is moderation necessary in desire and wanting, but also in the other three emotions, namely pain, joy, and fear’. The commentary on Galatians then clarifies the Exodus passage by qualifying the commandment to mean “you shall not covet [improperly].”

¹¹⁷ Mek. Yitro, parashat 8.

¹¹⁸ Others, “based on reckoning.”

Discussing this passage at length, Kugel notes that the ambiguity of the law creates several exegetical problems. What is the mishap that might not occur? Does the mishap happen to the unborn fetus or the mother? What is the punishment? How is the person punished? Is she fined according to the husband's wishes or is the penalty adjudicated by judges?¹¹⁹ Kugel goes on to note that the *iuxta Hebraeos* strikingly differs from the Septuagint and Philo. In the Septuagint, the mishap happens to the fetus who emerges not fully formed, but in the Vulgate it relates to the mother—no disaster occurs if the fetus perishes but the mother lives.¹²⁰ Similarly, in the case of the penalty, the Septuagint clarifies that only a fine is imposed, but the Vulgate “accurately duplicates, without deciding, the ambiguity of the traditional Hebrew text.”¹²¹ Kugel rightly notes the connection between Jerome and Jewish tradition because of the close parallels between the Vulgate and the midrash and Josephus. Both the Mekhilta de R. Ishmael (Neziqin 8) and Josephus state that the avoided mishap refers to the woman but, unlike the *iuxta Hebraeos*, both assign authority for the fine to the judges.¹²² Kugel is not surprised that Jerome follows Jewish tradition here, but it is strange that he rejects the contemporary reading of the verse preserved in the catenae and Augustine. Following the Septuagint, they attribute the disaster to the fetus and use the text to discuss when a human being becomes ensouled.¹²³ Augustine, for example, argues that Scripture is interested not so much in prohibiting attacks on pregnant women but rather in determining whether an unformed being can be considered ensouled.¹²⁴ Why, then, does Jerome prefer the Jewish over the Christian exegesis? Augustine's interpretation of this verse may provide an answer. Reading Exod 21:22–25 as a unit, Augustine views the law concerning the unformed fetus and the *lex talionis* (“eye for an eye,” etc.) as part of the divine economy of forgiveness. The purpose of the laws is to make clear to sinners for what they are being forgiven.

For if it is not known through the law what deserves punishment, from where would it be known what forgiveness would alleviate, so that it

119 Kugel, *Bible As It Was*, 395–96.

120 Philo, *Spec.* 3:108–109 (as cited by Kugel, *Bible As It Was*, 397): “If a man comes to blows with a pregnant woman and strikes her on the belly and she miscarries, then, if the result of the miscarriage is unshaped and undeveloped, he must be fined. . . .”

121 Kugel, *Bible As It Was*, 397.

122 *Ibid.*, 397–98.

123 *Catenae* 636–640.

124 Augustine, *Quaestiones et Locutiones in Heptateuchum* (CCSL 33; Turnholt: Brepols, 1958), 80.

could be said: “forgive our debts, just as we forgive those in debt to us” (Matt 6:10)? Therefore, debtors are demonstrated by the law, so that when forgiveness takes place it would be apparent what should be forgiven.¹²⁵

Jerome takes a different position, contrasting the harshness of the Mosaic law with the mercy of Christian teaching. Recalling Jesus’ reference to Exod 21:24 in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:38–39), Jerome tells Geruchia (*Epist.* 123.12), “then, it was eye for an eye, now we offer even the other cheek to the one who strikes us.”¹²⁶ The *iuxta Hebraeos*, following Jewish tradition, produces a harsh law that disregards the status of the fetus and does not embody any notion of forgiveness.¹²⁷ Augustine claims that a careful reading of the law reveals Christian notions of forgiveness. By eliminating any reference to the divine economy of forgiveness, Jerome preserves the idea that Jesus’ teaching supersedes Jewish law. Ironically, this closeness to rabbinic tradition distances Judaism from Christianity and returns us full circle to the theological program of *iuxta Hebraeos*. In the process of clarifying a legal text, Jerome inscribes a supersessionist theology.

5.5 Theology and Scholarship

16. Exod 33:7

MT וּמֹשֶׁה יָקַח אֶת־הָאֹהֶל וְנָטָה־לּוֹ מִחוּץ לַמִּחֲנֶה הָרֶחֶק מִזֶּה־הַמִּחֲנֶה וְקָרָא לוֹ אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד
וְהָיָה כָּל־מְבַקֵּשׁ יְהוָה יֵצֵא אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד אֲשֶׁר מִחוּץ לַמִּחֲנֶה

Now Moses would take the Tent and pitch it outside of the camp, at some distance from the camp. It was called the Tent of Meeting, and whoever sought the Lord would go out of the Tent of Meeting that was outside of the camp.

IH *Moses quoque tollens tabernaculum tetendit extra castra procul vocavitque nomen eius tabernaculum foederis et omnis populus qui*

¹²⁵ *Nisi enim per legem sciretur quid vindictae deberetur, unde sciretur quid venia relaxaret, ut dici posset: dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris? Debitores igitur lege monstrantur, ut quando ignoscitur adpareat quid dimittatur* (*Quaestiones et Locutiones in Heptateuchum* [CCSL 33; Turnholt: Brepols, 1958], 80).

¹²⁶ Cf. Jerome, *Epist.* 121.5.7.

¹²⁷ Some Jewish traditions temper the harshness of *lex talionis* by arguing that the impracticality of the principle indicates that monetary compensation replaces actual retaliation; see b. B. Qam. 83b–84a and Propp, *Exodus* 19–40, 227–31.

habebat aliquam quaestionem egrediebatur ad tabernaculum foederis extra castra.

LXX Καὶ λαβὼν Μωυσῆς τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ ἔπηξεν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς παρεμβολῆς, καὶ ἐκλήθη σκηνὴ μαρτυρίου· καὶ ἐγένετο πᾶς ὁ ζητῶν κύριον ἐξεπορεύετο εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς.

VL *et sumens tabernaculum Moyses, fixit illud extra castra, longe a castris et appellatum est Tabernaculum testimonii. Et fiebat ut omnis quicumque quaerebat Dominum, ibat ad Tabernaculum testimonii, foras extra castra.*

I will conclude with an apparently innocuous translation that in fact is fraught with meaning. In response to the embarrassing disaster of the Golden Calf, which can partially be blamed on his long absence from the Israelite camp while receiving the revelation on Mt. Sinai, Moses establishes a kind of sacral help desk:

Now Moses would take the Tent and pitch it outside of the camp, at some distance from the camp. It was called the Tent of Meeting, and *whoever sought the Lord* would go out of the Tent of Meeting that was outside of the camp.

Jerome, however, produces a sense strikingly different from the Hebrew. Rather than referring to an individual seeking guidance, he pictures the whole people (*omnis populus*) coming to the Tent of Meeting with a question. This image can be explained through his use of the term *quaestio*, a technical term well known among late antique scholars.¹²⁸ Based on the Greek ζητήσις ‘question, inquiry’, the term goes back to the Greek commentary tradition which consisted of questions (ζητήσεις) and answers (λύσεις) on Homer. This technique of Hellenistic Alexandrian scholars was picked up by Jewish writers such as Philo and later Christians such as Origen, while Theodoret and Augustine published works consisting of questions and answers on books of the Bible.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ Jerome may have been introduced to the idea through LXX ζητῶν, but he goes much further by using the noun *quaestio* rather than the participle of the Greek and the verb in the Hebrew and Old Latin.

¹²⁹ See Kamesar (1993); Sze-Kar Wan, “Philo’s Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesim: A Synoptic Approach,” *SBLSP* 32 (1993): 22–53; Marcos and Saenz-Badillos, *Theodoretī Cyrensis Quaestiones*; Agnethe Siquans, *Der Deuteronomiumkommentar des Theodoret von Kyros* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2002); and Annelie Volgers and Claudio Zamagni, eds., *Erotapokriseis : Early Christian Question-and-answer Literature in Context* (Leuven:

Moreover, in letters such as *Epistle* 36, he publicly responds to specific questions on Scripture raised by Pope Damasus. Therefore, the image of the people gathering to resolve a *quaestio* evokes the late antique image of a scholar publicly expounding a difficulty of Scripture.

There is an even more surprising feature in the translation. The Hebrew has “he who seeks the Lord,” but the Vulgate makes no reference to God. God has not disappeared but has become absorbed into the *quaestio*. Thus, Jerome does more than retroject Classical grammatical terminology into the desert experience of the Israelites. By placing *quaestio* in the Tent of Meeting, he equates his own exegetical work with encountering the Divine. Engaging in questions and answers on Torah translates a common Classical grammatical technique into a sacred act. Constructing Torah study as a sacred act correlates with a characteristic feature of rabbinic Judaism. For many rabbis, the Torah replaced the Temple as the locus of the cult. Many passages could be cited as evidence, but one text interprets Exod 33:7 in this vein by equating the teaching of Torah to appearing at the Tent of Meeting, the center of the sacrificial ritual:

Our Rabbis have taught. When our teachers entered the vineyard at Yavneh, there were among them R. Judah and R. Jose and R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer the son of R. Jose the Galilean. They all spoke in honour of hospitality and expounded texts [for that purpose]. R. Judah, the head of the speakers in every place, spoke in honour of the Torah and expounded the text, *Now Moses used to take the tent and pitch it without the camp* (Exod 33:7). Have we not here, he said, an argument *a fortiori*? Seeing that the Ark of the Lord was never more than twelve mil distant and yet the Torah says, *Everyone that sought the Lord went out unto the Tent of Meeting*, how much more [is this title ‘the one who seeks the Lord’ applicable to] the disciples of the wise who go from city to city and from province to province to learn Torah!¹³⁰

In transferring this rabbinic concept into the technical Classical term *quaestio* that describes his own scholarly activity, Jerome defines the exegesis of Scripture as a sacred act in and of itself. Such a move suggests that he mediates Classical traditions through rabbinic ideology, transgressing the bound-

Peeters, 2004). Of course, Jerome himself wrote an exegetical tract entitled *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* and may have planned a similar work on Exodus, although the evidence is somewhat flimsy; see above, p. 20.

130 b. Ber. 63b; trans. Epstein, *Babylonian Talmud*.

aries between Jewish, Classical, and Christian culture. Applying the Classical *quaestio* to Scripture and understanding this exegetical activity as a sacred act consonant with rabbinic ideology reflects the cultural amalgamation typical of Jerome. Late antiquity can constitute a time of ascribing and transgressing boundaries.

5.6 Conclusion

Analyzing Jewish traditions in Vg Exodus more than demonstrates the rabbinic element of Jerome's translation technique, his *recentiores*-rabbinic philology. The Jewish traditions in *iuxta Hebraeos* must be understood as exegesis in dialogue with his late antique Christian cultural context. An examination of exegetical traditions in Vg Exodus yields the following results: First, it is generally useful to read Jerome's translation against its late antique context (namely Classical, Jewish, and Christian culture) in order to understand it. Second, a careful reading of the translation increases the database of exegetical traditions incorporated into the Vulgate; this is especially useful in the case of Jewish traditions in which dating is such a vexatious issue. Third, these exegetical traditions account for the rationale behind interpretive renditions, namely, theological implications, an interest in *historia*, and the unique demands of legal exegesis. Fourth, Jerome's translation reflects the permeability of cultural boundaries characteristic of late antiquity. And, finally, reading the Vulgate in its late antique context provides information as to how the text might be understood in this time period. The next chapter expands on this last point by analyzing Vg Exodus as a work of late antique Latin literature.

The Late Antique Bible and Classical Tradition

6.1 Preliminary Remarks

In chapter 3, I showed how late antique Latin grammar provided a framework for engaging with the Hebrew text. In more theoretical terms, the translator's understanding of the target language influenced his rendering of the source text. There is another angle that focuses on the interaction between the target text and the target language and culture.¹ Exegetical renditions highlight this interaction when the interpretive element depends on the reception of the text in its cultural context. Jerome's grammatical approach to the Hebrew text, his critical application of Greek versions, and his incorporation of Jewish and Christian traditions of interpretation all demonstrate that he strongly translates the Hebrew, and these sources can account for the rationale behind particular renditions. His background always suggests the possibility that his reading of a particular text imitates or derives from his individual encounter with his predecessors. While such an approach correlates with the well-known iconography of Jerome the ascetic alone in his cell with books, skull, and dog, it neglects the fact that he had an audience, real or imagined, that impacted the character of his translation.² Thus, his activist approach to translation should

1 The source text-target text relationship differs from the target text-target language relationship. Raija Sollamo, "Translation Technique and Translation Studies: The Problem of Translation Universals," in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007*, ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 55 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 340, following Andrew Chesterman, "Hypotheses about Translation Universals," in *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, ed. Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjaer, and Daniel Gile (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2004) 1–13, distinguishes between S-universals (source text/target text) and T-universals (target text/target language).

2 One audience would be the women of his circle whose multilingualism and biblical knowledge enabled them to especially appreciate his skills and efforts as a biblical translator; see Paola Francesca Moretti, "Jerome's Epistolary Portraits of Holy Women," *Journal of Late Antiquity* 7.2 (2014): 286. The potential impact of the target audience on a translation as long been recognized by translation theorists; see Paul Valéry, "Variations on the Eclogues," in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 117; Gideon Toury, "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 199; Katharina Reiss, "Type,

be examined in relation to reception criticism. Reception criticism essentially focuses on how a text was understood by subsequent readers as opposed to the original meaning of the text.³

Therefore, now I turn to the audience of the *iuxta Hebraeos*, for “all reading of texts are *situated*, contingent upon their historical moment, and thus . . . *to understand is always to understand historically*. . . .”⁴ I draw on “the notion of ‘interpretive community,’ with shared assumptions, methods, and goals.”⁵ Jerome’s prefaces and letters persistently address this latter issue since they constantly defend his translation.⁶ Such a defense was necessary in light of events like the revolt in Oea of North Africa when the congregation refused to accept *iuxta Hebraeos*’ translation of Jonah 4:6.⁷ Thus, Jerome demonstrates a consciousness of how his translation was read. He did not, however, participate only in the community of the Latin Church. The appellation of *vir trilinguis* more than simply points to linguistic erudition—he participated in the Christian, Classical, and Jewish interpretive communities. To be sure, the nature of this relationship varied: he of course saw himself as a Christian, adopted an ambiguous attitude to Classical learning, and claimed to be a transmitter of Jewish learning. There is no doubt that he also imagined his readership as Christian, Classical, and to some extent Jewish.⁸

Kind and Individuality of Text: Decision Making in Translation,” in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 170; Eugene Nida, “Principles of Correspondence,” in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 127; and Ernst-August Gutt, “Translation as Interlingual Interpretive Use,” in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 386–87.

3 “Meaning, could we say, is always realized at the point of reception; if so, we cannot assume that an ‘intention’ is effectively communicated within any text”; Charles Martindale, *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 3.

4 Martindale, *Redeeming the Text*, 35. See also Gideon Toury, “A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?,” *BIOSSCS* 39 (2006): 15–17.

5 Martinadale, *Redeeming the Text*, 16, is summarizing Stanley Fish’s view.

6 See above chapter 1, p. 19.

7 Augustine, *Ep.* 71.5.

8 By Classical I mean Christian and pagan readers who would appreciate Latin eloquence and Classical references. Jerome does not necessarily imagine Jewish readers of his entire translation, but he does envision that his renditions will support disputations over particular verses between Jews and Christians; see J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975), 160. Kelly notes that, according to Augustine, Jews considered the Vulgate more accurate than the Septuagint (*Civ.* 18.43).

This idea of a community of readers pointed to by community criticism is enriched by intertextuality theory. Daniel Boyarin provides a coherent version of this theory:

The sovereign notion informing the present reading of midrash is “intertextuality.” This concept has several different accepted senses, three of which are important in my account of midrash. The first is that the text is always made up of a mosaic of conscious and unconscious citation of earlier discourse. The second is that texts may be dialogical in nature—contesting their own assertions as an essential part of the structure of their discourse—and that the Bible is a preeminent example of such a text. The third is that there are cultural codes, again either conscious or unconscious, which both constrain and allow the production (not creation) of new texts within the culture; these codes may be identified with the ideology of the culture, which is made up of the assumptions that people in the culture automatically make about what may or may not be true and possible, about what is natural in nature and in history.⁹

Essentially, Boyarin argues that the Bible regularly refers to itself, both consciously and unconsciously. Moreover, this reference is often dynamically responsive (i.e., affirming or critiquing, in other words, in dialogue) and these self references are associated with the culture that produced them.¹⁰ To be sure, Boyarin employs this theory in order to defend midrash as a legitimate, biblical interpretation of the Bible. I find striking the idea that “every author/speaker/human is constituted by all of the discourses which he/she has heard or read.”¹¹ For Jerome similarly describes the discourses he reads in existential terms. The judge in his famous dream rejects his claim and declares “you are a Ciceronian, not a Christian” (*tu es Ciceronianus non christianus*).¹² In short, “you

9 Daniel Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1990), 12.

10 On innerbiblical interpretation, see the now classic Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1961); and William M. Schniedewind, “Innerbiblical Exegesis,” in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books*, 502–9.

11 Boyarin, *Intertextuality*, 12.

12 Jerome, *Epist.* 22.30. See Neil Adkin, *Jerome on Virginity: A Commentary on the Libellus de Virginitate Servanda (Letter 22)* (Cambridge, UK: Francis Cairns, 2003). Similarly, when Jerome complains that his studies of Hebrew have diminished his ability to speak Latin, he indicates how Hebrew affects his intellect: *Sed omnem sermonis elegantiam et latin eloqui venustatem stridor lectionis hebraicae sordidavit* (*Comm. Gal.* Book Three, preface).

are what you read.” Moreover, while it is commonly recognized that Christian and Jewish readers interpret biblical verses in relation to other biblical texts, “intertextuality” also precisely describes the hermeneutic employed by the Classical grammarians of Jerome’s own time. For example, his own teacher Aelius Donatus reads Terence in relation to Vergil: “**Which plays he composed** (*fecisset*). he nicely says ‘composed’ (*fecisset*) because poets are so called from ‘composing’ (*apo tou poiein* [in Greek]). Likewise, Vergil ‘even Pollio himself composes’ (*facit*) new poems’ (*Ecl.* 3.86).¹³ Similarly, Servius reads Vergil in relation to other authors or Vergil himself. Thus, on *Aeneid* 1.4:

Cruel. Since ‘Juno’ comes from the word ‘helping’ (*iuuando*), many wonder why he calls her ‘cruel’ and think this is just a temporally contingent epithet, as if she is cruel toward the Trojans. Such people are unaware that for the ancients, ‘cruel’ used to mean ‘great’ as in Ennius, “she was clothed in a ‘cruel’ robe, that is ‘great.’” Likewise Vergil when he introduces Aeneas everywhere as pious, says in 12.107 “Aeneas, cruel in the arms from his mother’, that is ‘great.’”¹⁴

Since this form of interpretation no doubt played a role in his Classical education, it is reasonable to posit that Jerome reads Scripture through the Classical, in addition to Jewish and Christian, texts to which he was exposed and from which he was composed. In the previous chapters, especially chapters 3 and 5, I have examined examples of how the Classical background interacted with the Hebrew language and exegetical traditions in order to address the question of how the communities by which Jerome was constituted impacted his translation of the book of Exodus. In this chapter, I focus on the Classical and late antique intertext and how it impacts the *iuxta Hebraeos* and its readers. This requires reading the *iuxta Hebraeos* as a work of Latin literature.

This may be a rhetorical conceit to affirm his credentials as a biblical scholar; see Andrew Cain, ed. and trans., *St. Jerome: Commentary on Galatians*, The Gatherers of the Church 121 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 40–41.

13 *Quas fecisset fabulas bene ‘fecisset’, unde et poetae a faciendo dicti sunt, ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιεῖν. Sic Vergilius ‘Pollio et ipse facit nova carmina’ (Ecl. 3.86; see Commenti Donatiani Ad Terenti Fabulas, ed. H. T. Karsten [London: Sijthoff, 1912]).*

14 *Saevae cum a iuvando sit Iuno, quaerunt multi cur eam dixerit ‘saevam’, et putant temporale esse epitheton, quasi saeva circa Troianos, nescientes quod ‘saevam’ dicebant veteres magnam, ut Ennius induta fuit saeva stola, id est, ‘magna’. item Vergilius, cum ubique pium inducat Aeneam, ait (XII 107) maternis saevus in armis Aeneas, id est, magnus (see Servianorum in Vergilii Carmina Commentariorum, ed. E. K. Rand et al. [Lancaster: American Philological Association, 1946]).*

Although much has been written about Jerome and the Classics, scholars have focused on the role of Classical tradition in his letters, commentaries, and other writings.¹⁵ Moreover, most scholars, taking their starting point from the famous dream, have primarily sought to demonstrate that he did not, in fact, renounce Classical literature.¹⁶ This important argument is proven by the collection of Classical allusions, generally uncited by Jerome. However, very little work has been done on the relationship between the Classical tradition and the *iuxta Hebraeos*.¹⁷ This is surprising in light of the fact that Jerome studied under famous commentators and translators, and there is much Classical influence in his elegant phraseology. Moreover, he was in Rome during the intellectual assault of paganism on Christianity led by the Emperor Julian. Harald Hagendahl's magisterial study, *Latin Fathers and the Classics*, is a case in point. Hagendahl is interested in explaining the validity of Jerome's claim to renounce Classical literature (*Epist.* 22). Although his discussion for the most part does not consider the influence of Classical literature on the translation of the Bible, Hagendahl does demonstrate that he was actually reading Classical

15 See discussion and bibliography in H. Hagendahl and J. H. Waszink, "Hieronymus," *RAC* 15:34–39.

16 In contrast to Hagendahl's seminal work, Neil Adkin has argued that from 386–93, Jerome no longer regularly read Classical literature although he continued to cite the ancient authors from memory and may have consulted a text on occasion. See Adkin's numerous publications: "Some notes on the dream of St. Jerome," *Phil* 128 (1984): 119–26; "Some notes on the style of Jerome's 22nd letter," *RivFilolIstrClass* 112 (1984): 287–91; "Solo tantum: A Colloquialism in Saint Jerome," *Glotta* 62 (1984): 89–90; "Hieronymus Ciceronianus: The Catilinarians in Jerome," *Latomus* 51.2 (1992): 408–20; "Some Features of Jerome's Compositional Technique in the *Libellus de Virginitate Servanda* (*Epist.* 22)," *Phil* 136 (1992): 234–55; "Juvenal and Jerome," *CP* 89.1 (1994): 69–72; "Jerome's Vow 'Never to Reread the Classics': Some Observations," *REA* 101 (1999): 161–67; "Biblia Pagana: Classical Echoes in the Vulgate," *Aug* 40.1 (2000) 77–87; *Jerome on Virginity*; "Biblia Catilinaria," *Maia* 55 (2003): 93–98. While Adkin, "Jerome's Vow," 163 claims that even though Jerome did not take his vow seriously, "there is no evidence that he reread the classics in Hagendahl's second period (386–393 CE)." Adkin, "Biblia Catilinaria" also offers evidence that the vow had little influence on Jerome. Adkin is probably correct that immediately after the dream Jerome did not so much reject reading pagan authors as devote himself to learning Hebrew, scriptural studies, and Christian authors.

17 Catherine Brown Tkacz, "Labor tam utilis: The Creation of the Vulgate," *VC* 50 (1996): 42–72, and idem, "Ovid, Jerome, and the Vulgate" (*StPatr* 33; Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 378–82. Although Adkin, "Biblia Pagana," rejects Tkacz's identification of an allusion to Ovid in the Vulgate, he accepts in principle that Classical influences appear in the Vg Mark and Esther. See also Neil Adkin, "Vergil's Georgics and Jerome, *Epist.* 125, 11, 3–4," in *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* N.F. 22 (1998): 187–198.

authors during the period in which he composed his version, *iuxta Hebraeos*.¹⁸ Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose a general and specific impact of Classical authors on his translation. One might argue that Jerome conceptualized an inextricable gulf between Classical and biblical literature because he apologizes for citing pagan authors and prefers the simplicity of biblical discourse over pagan eloquence.¹⁹ However, these apologies are rare while he often juxtaposes biblical and pagan quotations on an equal level.²⁰ In one of these cases, *Epist.* 127.12, both a biblical verse and Vergilian verse highlight pathos with the literary trope of anaphora. Without a doubt alluding to the conquest of Rome by Alaric, Jerome cites the capture of Moab in Isa 15:1 (*nocte Moab capta est, nocte cecidit murus eius*) together with a Vergilian passage from the fall of Troy in book two of the *Aeneid* (*Aen.* 2.361–65: *quis cladem illius noctis, quis funera fando/explicit*).²¹ In addition, although he recognized that Christian tradition imposed a simple discourse and therefore translated the Bible accordingly, his “attitude, as usual, is inconsistent.”²² My comparison of the *iuxta Hebraeos* with other translations indicates that Jerome’s version has a greater degree of complexity. For example, he utilizes hypotaxis far more often than the Hebrew

-
- 18 Jerome was actually reading Plautus from 392–402 (Harald Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics* [Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958], 270); Terence from 387–95, although always quite familiar with him (272); Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Sallust, and Quintillian throughout his life (280–81, 283–84, 294–95); and Juvenal, Persius, and Martial in the 390s (284); Lucan from 408–14 (284), and he quotes Lucretius from memory (275). The probability that Jerome was not reading Classical literature from 386–93 (Adkin, “Jerome’s Vow”) requires a more nuanced description: he began to reread pagan authors while translating the Hebrew Bible. Adkin’s numerous publications have noted a number of Classical references missed or misidentified by Hagendahl. Similarly, Andrew Cain, *Jerome’s Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) has recovered a number of such references.
- 19 For the apologetic attitude to citations of pagans, see Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers*, 303. On Jerome’s preference for simplicity in the liturgical setting, see *ibid.*, 313.
- 20 *Ibid.*, 302–3.
- 21 Lines 364 and 365 repeat *plurima*. Hagendahl (*ibid.*, 259) acknowledges the pathetic effect of both quotations but does not notice that both the Bible and Vergil use the same technique of anaphora to create this pathos.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 313 and n.6. Compare, e.g., *Epist.* 22.30, *Si quando . . . prophetam legere coepissem, sermo horrebat incultus* ‘whenever I began to read the prophet, the uncultivated discourse made me cringe’ and *Epist.* 53.10 *Nolo offendaris in scripturis sanctis simplicitate et quasi vilitate verborum, quae vel vitio interpretum vel de industria sic prolatae sunt, ut rusticam contionem facilius instruerent* ‘don’t be bothered by the simplicity of the Holy Scriptures and by the, as it were, linguistic deficiency, which have been produced either by incompetent translators or on purpose in order to instruct the common folk more easily.’

and its translations. That he improves the style of previous translations corresponds to the primary motivation behind his reacquaintance with Classical literature. In order to explain why Jerome “[a]s a Christian . . . felt obliged to condemn pagan literature, but he could not cease admiring—and reading—what he condemned,” Hagendahl contends that he sought to recapture “all the elegance and charm of Latin discourse” which he had lost from inattention to the Classics.²³

In some cases, instead of trying to prove simply that Jerome continued to employ Classical authors, I identify the method, reason, and impact of drawing on Classical authors. I consider the influence of the Classical tradition on his rendition of Exodus from three vantage points. First, I demonstrate the influence of Classical scholarship on his method of translation. Second, I note the formal impact of pagan interpretations of particular verses of Exodus on the *iuxta Hebraeos*. Third, I consider renditions that become significant because of their meaning in a Classical context.

6.2 Method

Classical tradition influenced Jerome’s method of translation both in general principles and in specific cases. In agreement with Cicero, Horace, and Terence, he sympathizes with the idiomatic (*sensus ad sensum*) translation in contrast to the literal (*verbum ad verbum*) rendering.²⁴ Moreover, his comparative method conforms to the standards prevalent in the Classical commentary literature of his day. Just as a commentator expounded a text by presenting different interpretations, Jerome considers various translations, recensions, and exegetical traditions.²⁵ Finally, his understanding of *sensus* closely correlates with his grammatical/rhetorical education. As demonstrated in chapter 3, the particular issues that concern Jerome the translator likewise concerned the Classical grammarians and commentators.²⁶ These issues include changes in

23 *Omnem sermonis elegantiam et Latini eloquii venustatem*, Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers*, 310–11, 323–24. Adkin, “Jerome’s Vow,” 166–67 disagrees.

24 See above, pp. 45–49.

25 *Ruf. 1.16 Puto quod puer legeris . . . in Terentii comoedias praeceptoris mei Donati aequae in Vergilium. . . . Argue interpretes eorum, quare non unam explanationem secuti sint et in eadem re quid vel sibi vel aliis videatur enumerent.*

26 See, e.g., Aelius Donatus’ comments on Terence, *Andr.* 1–10, 12–18, 22–26, 28–32, 34–38, 41–42, 45, 51, 55, 57, 58, 61–63, 65, and 67. See also David Dietz, “*Historia* in the Commentary of Servius,” *TAPA* 125 (1995): 61–97.

number,²⁷ variation,²⁸ parallelism,²⁹ syntax,³⁰ clause connectors,³¹ hypotaxis,³² periphrasis,³³ tense,³⁴ word order,³⁵ and paronomasia.³⁶ In this connection, it is necessary to identify the types of obscurities that the *iuxta Hebraeos* clarifies: explaining Hebrew idioms, specifying terms, maintaining narrative and technical logic, creating vivid images, producing clearer Latin, realizing connotations, and adding emphasis. These are precisely the sorts of issues that concerned ancient commentators. Indeed, Louis Holtz, the noted scholar of Latin grammar and editor of Aelius Donatus' *Ars Grammatica*, adds "grammarian of scripture" (technicien de l'Écriture) to Jerome's distinguished literary and intellectual talents.³⁷

Thus, like a grammarian, he furnished for Scripture grammatical tools (*instrumenta grammaticae*) such as *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum* and *Liber de situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum*.³⁸ Moreover, we find

27 E.g., Donatus, *Ars Maior* II.7's discussion of the various categories of number in Latin.

28 Marc Baratin, *La Naissance de la Syntax à Rome* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1989), 447–457.

29 By parallelism I mean the repetition of sounds, words, and syntax. The grammarians tend to classify these schemes under the rubric of *geminatio* (Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.29), *conduplicatio* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.28.38) or *repetitio* (Louis Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion [IV^e–IX^e siècle et édition critique]*. [Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1981], 195). Donatus, *Ars Maior* III.5 refers to the subcategories *anadiplose*, *anaphore*, *epanalepse*, and *epizeuxis*.

30 Donatus, *Ars Maior* II and III deals with a variety of syntactic issues.

31 "De coniunctione" in *ibid.*, II.15.

32 Although Donatus does not specifically refer to *hypotaxis*, he does discuss the opposite schemata, polysyndeton and asyndeton (*ibid.*, III.4.16–17).

33 *Ibid.*, III.5.9.

34 *Ibid.*, II.12.

35 E.g., hyperbaton (*ibid.* III.5.10).

36 *Ibid.*, III.4.9.

37 Sans perdre de vue le styliste, le rhéteur, le pamphlétaire, le lutteur, le penseur, bref tous les aspects d'une très riche personnalité et d'un écrivain qui a mis sa plume au service de sa foi, Jérôme apparaît d'abord comme un technicien de l'Écriture, et c'est bien ainsi que l'ont vu ses contemporains, c'est bien ainsi qu'il a été toute sa vie consulté: comme on consulte un grammairien, sur tous sujets d'étudition. 'Without losing sight of the stylist, rhetorician, essayist, polemicist, thinker, in short all the elements of a rich personality and a writer who devoted his pen to serve his faith, Jerome first appears as a technician of Scriptures, and his contemporaries saw him as such and this is how he viewed his whole life: as a grammarian, consulted on all aspects of learning'. (Holtz, *Donat et la tradition*, 37).

38 *Ibid.*, 37–38.

grammatical references common to Jerome and Donatus on interjections, antiphrasis, plural forms with singular meanings, and pleonasm.³⁹

6.3 Exegetical Traditions

Three treatises appeared during Jerome's lifetime that provide specific evidence for a pagan⁴⁰ reading of particular verses of Scripture: the emperor Julian's *Against the Galileans*, Ambrosiaster's *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*,⁴¹ and *Collatio Legum Romanarum et Mosaicarum*.⁴² Because the latter two texts were written by Christians, they require a careful analysis to grasp their pagan background. In the case of the *Quaestiones Veteris*, the

39 On interjections: *Sicuti nos in lingua latina habemus et interiectiones quasdam, ut in exultando dicamus 'vae' et in admirando 'papae; et in dolendo 'heu' . . . ita et Hebraei . . .* (Jerome, *Epist.* 20.5.1) and *quia aut laetitiam significamus ut 'evax'; aut dolorem, ut 'heu', aut admirationem ut 'papae' . . .* (Don. *Ars Minor* 9, 602; Holtz, *Donat et la tradition*, 39). Similarly, on antiphrasis (Jerome, *Epist.* 78.33 and *Ars Maior* III.8), plural forms with singular meaning (Jerome, *Comm. Isa.* 1.2 and Donatus, *Ars Maior* II.8), and pleonasm (*Comm. Dan.* 11.17 and Donatus, *Ars Maior* III.14; Holtz, *Donat et la tradition*, 39). Although the exempla for pleonasm do not agree, Jerome cites two common Vergilian passages (Aen. 1.614 and 4.359), the latter of which is described as a pleonasm in Donatus' commentary on Vergil.

40 "Pagan" can be a problematic term because it inaccurately implies a comprehensive, systematic religious and social system; see Philip Rousseau, "Pagan, Paganism," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd. ed., ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1091 and Peter Brown, "Pagan," in *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G. W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 625. I use the term here cautiously for lack of a better option as the most accurate way to describe Jerome's understanding of non-Christians and non-Jews. He refers to non-Christians and non-Jews as barbarians or by their individual names (Cicero, Vergil, etc.).

41 There has been a resurgence of important research on the formerly neglected Ambrosiaster. Particularly noteworthy is Marie-Pierre Bussières, *Ambrosiaster: Contre les païens (Question sur l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament 14) et Sur le destin (Question sur l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament 15)*, SC 512 (Paris: Cerf, 2007); Sophie Lunn-Rockcliffe, *Ambrosiaster's Political Theology*, O ECS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); and Emanuele Di Santo, *L'apologetica dell'Ambrosiaster: Cristiani, pagani e fidei nella Roma tardoantica*, SEAug 112 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2008). For an overview of these recent trends, see David Hunter, "2008 NAPS Presidential Address: The Significance of Ambrosiaster," *J ECS* 17 (2009): 1–26.

42 These references have been collected in Giancarlo Rinaldi, *Biblia Gentium: primo contributo per un indice delle citazioni, dei riferimenti e delle allusioni alla bibbia negli autori pagani, greci e latini, di età imperiale* (Rome: Libreria sacre scritture, 1989).

questions themselves may be from actual interlocutors or invented by Ambrosiaster himself.⁴³ His real or imagined opponents include “heretics, pagans, Jews, and even arrogant deacons.”⁴⁴ Therefore, the pagan origin of the question is not definite. The response to the question may be considered as well because it often clarifies the meaning and motivation of the interlocutor’s question. The *Quaestiones Veteris* is of especial interest because Jerome engaged in polemics with Ambrosiaster concerning particular questions on Scripture and his translation of the New Testament.⁴⁵ As we shall see below, this further complicates the use of *Quaestiones Veteris* because the Vulgate rendition could represent a reaction to Ambrosiaster rather than a pagan criticism of the Bible. At least, though, the question represents an exegetical crux from the Latin tradition.

The *Collatio* engenders more profound difficulties because it was most likely compiled by a Christian.⁴⁶ I treat it as pagan text, however, because the work was directed toward non-Christian (and Christian) jurists, and the collator, also a jurist, reflects Roman legal traditions.⁴⁷ The format of the work also

43 Lunn-Rockcliffe, *Ambrosiaster's Political Theology*, 69. The specific identity of Ambrosiaster is unclear and his anonymity was probably intentional, but we do know that he was a Christian flourishing in Rome in the 380s familiar with pagan culture and institutions; see Hunter, “2008 NAPS Presidential Address,” 5–9; Lunn-Rockcliffe, *Ambrosiaster's Political Theology*, 11–62; and Bussi  res, *Ambrosiaster*, 30–40.

44 Lunn-Rockcliffe, *Ambrosiaster's Political Theology*, 67. Although, according to Marie-Pierre Bussi  res, “Ambrosiaster's Second Thoughts About Eve,” *J ECS* 23 (2015): 58 n. 11, most of Ambrosiaster's interlocutors were Christian, “his apologetics often tap on traditional pagan polemics.”

45 See Heinrich Vogels, “Ambrosiaster und Hieronymus,” *RB  n* 66 (1956): 14–19 and Henry Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great*, *Oxford History of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 380. Vogels' assessment has recently been endorsed and expanded by Andrew Cain, “In Ambrosiaster's Shadow: A Critical Re-Evaluation of the Last Surviving Letter Exchange between Pope Damasus and Jerome,” *Revue des   tudes augustiniennes* 51 (2005): 257–77 and Stephen A. Cooper and David G. Hunter, “Ambrosiaster Redactor Sui: the Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles (Excluding Romans),” *RevEtAug* 56 (2010): 69–91. See also Di Santo, *L'apologetica*, 30–38.

46 Robert Frakes, “The Religious Identity and Purpose of the Compiler of the *Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum* or *Lex Dei*,” in *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, ed. Robert M. Frakes and DePalma Digeser (Toronto: Edgar Kent, 2006), 126–47 and Robert M. Frakes, *Compiling the Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

47 For much of the twentieth century, the work was attributed to a pagan author; see M. Hyamson, ed., *Mosaicarum et Romanarum Legum Collatio* (London: Oxford University

creates difficulties. It is challenging to elicit the Roman legal interpretation of Scripture because the text simply juxtaposes paraphrases of biblical law with gleanings from the Roman law codes. It rarely has any discussion explicitly comparing both legal systems.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, the text can be quite useful. In his treatise *Against the Galileans*, the emperor Julian provides evidence that his age had an interest in the comparative approach to biblical law. After describing the decalogue, he compares the two legal systems:

Now except for the command “Thou shalt not worship other gods,” and “remember the sabbath day,” what nation is there, I ask in the name of the gods, which does not think that it ought to keep the other commandments? So much so that penalties have been ordained against those who transgress them, sometimes more severe, and sometimes similar to those enacted by Moses, though they are sometimes more humane.⁴⁹

Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that Jerome considered biblical law in relation to Roman law.

Since, however, we cannot prove that he was familiar with the *Collatio*, we cannot be certain what particular Roman legal tradition impacted his translation.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, the *Collatio* does represent at least one late fourth- or early fifth-century opinion concerning what Roman legal discussions would

Press, 1913) and, more recently, Robert Frakes, “Religious Identity and Purpose,” 126–47 and Frakes, *Compiling the Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum*, 124–51. Leonard Rutgers, *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 210–52 claims the author was Jewish. Andrew S. Jacobs, “‘Papinian Commands One Thing, Our Paul Another’: Roman Christians and Jewish Law in the *Collatio Mosaicarum et Romanarum*,” in *Religion and Law in Classical and Christian Rome*, edited by Clifford Ando and Jörg Rüpke (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2006), 85–99, contra Rutgers, describes the author of the *Collatio* as a Christian formulating an identity that simultaneously expresses “affinity with and authority over” (98) his Jewish and pagan roots.

48 *Coll.* VII.i.1 is an exception: “just as the Twelve Tables order a thief in the night to be killed in any case [or a thief in the daytime], if he dares to defend himself with a weapon, know oh jurists, that Moses ordained this earlier, just as a close reading [*lectio*] shows” (Frakes, *Compiling the Collatio*, 11).

49 ποῖον ἔθνος ἐστὶ πρὸς τῶν θεῶν ἕξω τοῦ ‘Οὐ προσκυνήσεις θεοῖς ἐτέτεροις’ καὶ τοῦ ‘Μνήσθητι τῆς ἡμέρας τῶν σαββάτων’ ὃ μὴ τὰς ἄλλας οἶεται χρῆναι φυλάττειν ἐντολὰς, ὥς καὶ τιμωρίας κείσθαι τοῖς παραβαίνουσιν, ἐνιαχοῦ μὲν σφοδροτέρας, ἐνιαχοῦ δὲ παραπλασίας ταῖς παρὰ Μωυσέως νομοθετείσαις, ἔστι δὲ ὅπου καὶ φιλανθρωποτέτας (Julian, *Galil.* 152d [Wright, LCL]).

50 Any direct influence of the *Collatio* on Jerome or Jerome on the *Collatio* is highly unlikely because the *Collatio* relies on the Old Latin; see Frakes, *Compiling the Collatio*, 88–89.

be parallel to biblical law.⁵¹ It is possible, then, that Jerome may have either independently made similar connections or indirectly learned of these comparisons. In addition to being a helpful collection of Roman legal material that relates to the Bible, the *Collatio*'s schematic format does not preclude any interpretive activity. For by classifying biblical laws under Roman headings, the *Collatio* makes an exegetical judgment.⁵² Moreover, the particular Roman material which is collated functions as an interpretation by defining the significant issues of a particular biblical law. For example, in its Hebrew context, the biblical law about beating a slave to death (Exod 21:20–21) represents one of several cases of contingent homicide and the appropriate restitution.⁵³ Since the *Collatio* places these verses under Title 3: Concerning the Law and Cruelty of Masters (*de jure et saevitia dominorum*) and includes the comments of various Roman jurists on this same topic, it interprets the biblical verse as dealing with masters and slaves rather than restitution for homicide.⁵⁴

Against the Galileans, *Quaestiones Veteris*, and the *Collatio*, used judiciously, at the least provide information about exegetical issues relevant to pagans. I rely on these sources whenever possible. Since the examples discussed below do not demonstrate a particularly systematic method, it makes most sense to present them seriatim. For the sake of clarity, I have divided them between instances of legal and narrative interpretations. All these cases show the impact of current exegetical issues on Jerome's translation.

6.3.1 *Legal Latin Exegesis*

The translation of the term "law" itself demonstrates engagement with Classical tradition. Jerome renders עוֹלָם עֶקֶת 'eternal law' (Exod 12:14) with the more religious term *cultus sempiternus* 'eternal veneration'. LXX νόμιμον, σ' πρόσταγμα, and VL *legitimum* all contain the legal denotation, while α' strangely reads ἀκριβείαν, perhaps meaning 'minuteness' or 'strict discipline' which may have suggested *cultus*. Similarly, in 12:17, Jerome renders the same phrase *ritus*

51 Frakes, *Compiling the Collatio*, 35–65 dates the work to 392–95.

52 Frakes agrees with most scholars "that the Collator modelled the structure of his work... on the second half of the Ten Commandments" (*Compiling the Collatio*, 100). Even so, the biblical citations corresponding to the sixteen titles of the *Collatio* do not follow the order of the Bible as Frakes' table (315) shows. The Roman legal rubric determines the classification of the biblical text.

53 The cases culminate in a version of the *lex talionis*: eye for eye, tooth for tooth, etc. (Exod 21:24–25).

54 Since Title 1 deals with homicide, and Titles 2 and 3 deal primarily with death, the predominant organizational principle could be the sixth commandment; see Frakes, *Compiling the Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum*, 101.

perpetuus ‘continuous religious observance’. As a result of this translation, one of Emperor Julian’s criticisms of Christianity is mitigated. In *Against the Galileans* 319d–e, Julian cites Exod 12:14–15 in order to refute the Christian claim that God assigned a second law after the first such that the first law applied only to a particular time period and place.⁵⁵ Since Exod 12:14–15 supplies one of the many references to a νόμιμον αἰώνιον ‘eternal law’, the Christians must be arguing falsely. By employing cultic instead of legal terminology, Jerome defends the Christian position by reducing Julian’s proof-text to an unconvincing mistranslation. The religious observance is eternal, not the entire covenantal legislation.⁵⁶

1. Exod 21:12–13

MT מכה איש וַמָּת מוֹת יוֹמָת. וְאֲשֶׁר לֹא צָדָה וְהֶאֱלִיִּים אֱנָה לִידּוֹ וְשִׁמְתִּי לָךְ מָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יָנוּס שָׂמָּה

He who **fatally** strikes a man shall be put to death. If he did not do it by design, but it came about by an act of God, I will assign you a place to which he can flee.

IH *qui percusserit hominem volens occidere morte moriatur. qui autem non est insidiatus sed Deus illum tradidit in manu eius constituam tibi locum quo fugere debeat.*

55 Λέγουσι γὰρ τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ τῷ προτέρῳ νόμῳ θεῖναι τὸν δεύτερον. Ἐκεῖνον μὲν γὰρ γενέσθαι πρὸς καιρὸν περιγεγραμμένον χρόνας ὀρισμένους... ‘For they assert that God, after the earlier law, appointed the second. For, say they, the former arose with a view to a certain occasion and was circumscribed by definite periods of time...’ (Wright, LCL).

56 In contrast, following LXX and VL, in Exod 12:24, there is the rare use of the legal terminology *verbum... legitimum* ‘legal... word’ for הַחֵק... הַדָּבָר. There are three possible explanations: Moses slightly alters the divine word when reporting to the elders, Jerome distinguishes between חֵק and חֶקֶה (which not only has a different gender, it also has the dagesh in the *quf*), or the collocation with דָּבָר rather than עוֹלָם is significant. Nevertheless, the primary emphasis in the translation is on the ritual character of the Passover law. Jerome variously renders עֲבוּדָה ‘work/service’ with *caerimonia* in Exod 12:25 and *religio* in Exod 12:26 and in Exod 12:43, he renders הַפֶּסַח חֶקֶה *religio phase*. *Lex* appears but only as the rendering of תוֹרָה in Exod 12:49 and Exod 13:9. In Exod 13:5, for אֶת־הָעֲבֹדָה הַזֹּאת ‘and you shall serve this service’ he clearly uses cultic terminology: *celebrabis hunc morem sacrorum* as in Exod 13:10, where he renders הַחֶקֶה הַזֶּה as *huiuscemodi cultum*. Not only does this differ from the LXX νόμιμον, it also rejects α’ ἀκριβασμα and σ’ πρόσταγμα. Similarly, in Exod 18:20 Jerome is much more specific than the Hebrew (laws/teachings) and versions in reading *ostendasque populo caerimonias et ritum colendi*.

LXX Ἐὰν δὲ πατάξῃ τις τινα, *καὶ ἀποθάνῃ*, θανάτῳ θανατούσθω· ὁ δὲ οὐχ ἐκὼν, ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς παρέδωκεν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, δώσω σοι τόπον, οὗ φεύξεται ἐκεῖ ὁ φονεύσας.

After the ten commandments, the first major law code in Scripture appears, the so-called Covenant Code (Exod 20:22[19]–23:19).⁵⁷ Consisting of a variety of laws covering such topics as slavery, murder, robbery, judicial proceedings, and the cult, it complements the principles espoused in the decalogue. Introducing the theme of murder in Exod 21:12, the Hebrew refers to what seems to be involuntary manslaughter: “If a person strikes another who dies, he shall be put to death.” The Vulgate rendition of Exod 21:12, however, does not follow the Hebrew exactly but identifies this as a case of premeditated murder: “whoever strikes a person, wishing to kill him, shall be put to death.” It is certainly possible that Jerome logically derives his rendition of Exod 21:12 from the next verse: *qui autem non est insidiatus sed Deus illum tradidit in manu eius* ‘who, however, does not lay in wait but God delivers him into his hand’, especially with the contrastive clause connector *autem* ‘however’ added into the Latin. Such must be the explanation of an anonymous catena, which, stressing the intention of the murderer, contrasts the unintentional homicide “mentioned next [in Scripture] with the [previously mentioned] premeditated homicide.”⁵⁸ Nevertheless, identifying the source of the *iuxta Hebraeos* does not explain why it highlights the central legal issue, the question of intention. The Roman angle of the *Collatio* provides a solution. *Collatio* I.i–xiii identifies the distinction itself between intentional and unintentional homicide as a similarity between Jewish and Roman law. For example, under the headings “On Murderers” and “On Accidental Homicides,” the *Collatio* juxtaposes Mosaic laws on homicide (Num 35:16–25) with Ulpian’s comment, “preserving a distinction between accident (*casus*) and premeditation (*voluntas*) in a homicide is confirmed in a rescript of Hadrian.”⁵⁹ Hadrian’s rescript, as quoted

57 William Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 304–8.

58 Catena 628 p. 97 (no attribution). Τὸν ἀκουσίως φονεύοντα λέγει καταφεύγειν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον. Καίπερ λέγων κατὰ συγχώρησιν θεοῦ γεγενῆσθαι τὸν φόνον, ὅμως κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον αὐτὸς εἰργάσατο τὸν φόνον, καὶ δεῖ διακριθῆναι τὰ τῆς διαθέσεως, ἵνα μὴ ὡς φονεὺς ἀπόλῃται. Catena 629 p. 97 (no attribution) seems to go with 628 Ἄνωτέρῳ εἰπὼν περὶ τοῦ ἀκουσίως φονεύοντος, ὥδε περὶ τοῦ θελήσαντος φονεῦσαι, μὴ μὴν ἐπιτυχόντος τοῦ σκοποῦς, διαλέγεται, τὴν προαίρεσιν τιμωρούμενος, καὶ τοῦ ἔργου μὴ γεγονότος.

59 *Distinctionem casus et voluntatis in homicidio servari rescripto Hadriani confirmatur* (Coll. I.vi.1). Although the *Collatio* quotes from the book of Numbers, the parallel to Exodus is obvious. Exod 21:12 begins with *qui percusserit hominem* while Num 35:16 starts with *si quis ferro percusserit*.

by Ulpian, actually contains the phrase used by the *iuxta Hebraeos*: *voluit occidere* ‘intended to kill’. Jerome translates Mosaic legislation into the legal discourse of late antiquity.

2. Exod 21:20

MT וְכִי־יִכֶּה אִישׁ אֶת־עַבְדּוֹ אוֹ אֶת־אֲמָתוֹ בַּשֶּׁבֶט וּמַת תַּחַת יָדוֹ נָקָם יִנָּקֶם

IH *qui percusserit servum suum, vel ancillam virga, et mortui fuerint in manibus ejus, **criminis reus erit.***

Is a master who kills a servant guilty of homicide? The Hebrew of Exod 21:20 vaguely indicates that the master will experience some kind of punishment. Instead of the more general נָקָם יִנָּקֶם ‘he will surely be avenged’ (Exod 21:20), however, Jerome imagines a more specific judicial setting by rendering with *criminis reus erit* ‘he will be guilty of a crime’ or ‘he will be subject to an accusation’. It could be a clarification of LXX δάκη ἐκδικαθήτω ‘let him be judged in court’. Another possible source, however, could be the interpretation of this passage in *Collatio* III.i.–iv.. The *Collatio* quotes a version of the Bible which renders the phrase *iudicio vindicetur* ‘he will be avenged in a judgment’. Although one manuscript of VL reads *vindicatio vindicetur* (Lugdenensis), Augustine (*Spec. c.* 59) has *iudicio vindicetur*.⁶⁰ Since the *Collatio* then quotes from Paulus’ comment on the *Lex Cornelia*—*servus si plagis defecerit, nisi id dolo fiat, dominus homicidii reus non potest postulari* ‘if the servant dies from the blows, but if this did not happen deceitfully, then the master cannot be charged (*reus* . . . *postulari*) with homicide’—it equates “he will be avenged in a judgment” (*iudicio vindicetur*) to being charged with homicide (*homicidii reus* . . . *postulari*). Not only does Jerome’s use of *reus* agree with the *Collatio*, the more generic *criminis* also correlates with the sense of the *Collatio*. The *Collatio* states that such an individual is not guilty of homicide (*reus homicidii*), while the Vulgate indicates that the person is potentially guilty (*reus*) but perhaps of a lesser crime instead of homicide. This rendering clarifies the similarity of the Roman and Jewish law in that both treat the master who kills a slave as potentially subject to a trial. For the phrasing of the MT/LXX/VL does not rule out the charge of homicide, whereas *crimen* instead of *homicidium* allows the possibility of a lesser charge.

3. Exod 22:2

MT (22:1) אִם־בַּמַּחֲתָרֶת יִמָּצֵא הַגָּנֵב וְהָכָה וּמַת אִין לֹו דָמִים

60 Frakes, *Compiling the Collatio*, 255.

IH *si effringens fur domum sive suffodiens fuerit inventus, et accepto vulnere mortuus fuerit, percussor non erit reus sanguinis*

Two points in the rendering of Exod 22:2 (MT 22:1) reflect an interpretive process when read from a Latin point of view. First of all, the Hebrew refers to a case in which a thief is found in a tunnel (בִּמְחֻתָּרָה), whereas Jerome renders the single Hebrew word with two ideas: “if a thief breaking into a home or digging underneath (is found).”⁶¹ Nor should *effringens* and *suffodiens* be understood as synonymous. *Suffodiens*, derived from the Hebrew (tunnel), refers to secretly entering the house by burrowing underneath, whereas *effringens* refers to bursting through the doors into the home. Secondly, Jerome understands אֵין דָּמִים לוֹ, which literally means ‘there are no bloods to him’, as an idiom for *non erit reus sanguinis* ‘he will not be guilty of shedding blood’. Both the distinction between *suffodiens* and *effringens* and the interpretation that the homeowner is innocent of a capital offense correspond to the response to this verse in *Collatio* VII.i–v. Roman law defends the right of the homeowner to kill a thief at night.⁶² Roman law also makes a distinction between various forms of robbery: “thieves who defend themselves, those who break in (*effractores*) and others like these.”⁶³ Although the *iuxta Hebraeos* does not directly parallel this comment, the *Collatio* does provide evidence that Jerome borrowed the category of *effringere* from Roman law.

6.3.2 Narrative Latin Exegesis

4. Exodus 4:22–26

And you shall say to Pharaoh, Thus says the LORD, Israel is my first-born son, (23) and I say to you, Let my son go that he may serve me; You refused to let him go. *Lo, I slay your first-born son.* (24) At a lodging place on the way the LORD met him and sought to kill him. (25) Then Zippo'rah took a flint and cut off her son's foreskin, and touched Moses' feet with it, and said, “Surely you are a bridegroom of blood to me!” (26) So he let him alone. Then it was that she said, “You are a bridegroom of blood,” because of the circumcision.⁶⁴

61 *Si effringens fur domum sive suffodiens (fuerit inventus).* . . . The participles are not significant because the Hebrew could be read as a participle and the Vetus Latina has *perfodiens*.

62 According to Paulus, e.g., *si quis furem nocturnum vel diurnum cum se telo defenderet occiderit, hac quidem lege [lex Cornelia de sicaris et veneficis] non tenetur* (Coll. VII.ii.1).

63 Ulpianus (Coll. VII.iv.1): *sed si se telo fures defendunt vel effractores vel ceteri his similes nec quemquam percusserunt . . . adficiendi erunt.*

64 Adapted from NRSV.

Vg (22) *dicesque ad eum: Haec dicit Dominus: Filius meus primogenitus Israel.* (23) *Dixi tibi: Dimitte filium meum ut serviat mihi; et noluisti dimittere eum: ecce ego interficiam filium tuum primogenitum.* (24) *Cumque esset in itinere, in diversorio occurrit ei Dominus, et volebat occidere eum.* (25) *Tulit idcirco Sephora acutissimam petram, et circumcidit praeputium filii sui, tetigitque pedes ejus, et ait: Sponsus sanguinum tu mihi es.* (26) *Et dimisit eum postquam dixerat: Sponsus sanguinum ob circumcisionem mihi es.*

The extremely complicated narrative in 4:22–26 concerning the circumcision of Moses’ son has many ambiguities: Does Moses say to Pharaoh or does God say to Moses “Lo, I will kill your first born son” (4:23)? Does God meet Moses or his firstborn son, and does God intend to kill Moses or his firstborn son? And why does Zipporah circumcise the son? Jerome both maintains and resolves these ambiguities. By beginning verse 24 with the clause connector *cumque*, he joins verse 24 to 23. This connection makes sense only if he understood “Lo, I will kill your first born son” (*ecce ego interficiam filium tuum*) as addressed to Moses. The referent of the third person singular in verse 24—*Dominus . . . volebat occidere eum* ‘the Lord . . . sought to kill him’—remains ambiguous because it may refer to Moses or Moses’ son. The Latin, however, clarifies why Zipporah knew to circumcise her son: *idcirco* ‘for this reason,’ because God was intending to kill him [Moses or the child].

By reading the Vulgate in dialogue with pagan(?) questions about this verse, we gain a deeper understanding of the Latin rendition. The anonymous interlocutor in *Quaestiones Veteris* 16 asks, “Why is the angel, who intended to kill Moses on the road, dissuaded by the circumcision of the infant.”⁶⁵ Here, there is no ambiguity that God intends to kill Moses. Rather, as we learn from Ambrosiaster’s response, the question can be understood in three ways: why does the angel intend to kill Moses,⁶⁶ why was circumcision necessary,⁶⁷ and how did Zipporah know this? To the last issue, he argues that either Zipporah deduced it or Moses deduced it and then informed Zipporah. For Scripture requires deduction because it communicates sparingly: *quod compendio loquitur scriptura* (*Quaestiones Veteris* 16). Jerome’s version corrects and adapts Ambrosiaster’s reading as follows: God tells Moses, “I will kill your firstborn

65 *Quare angelus, qui in via occidere volebat Moysen, circumcissione infantis pacatus est?* Rinaldi, *Biblia Gentium*, 267).

66 E.g., Moses needed correction because he had acted thoughtlessly.

67 E.g., the Israelites would question Moses’ legitimacy if he arrived with uncircumcised children.

son" (and Moses tells Zipporah), but on the road God intends to kill Moses or his son. Because of this attempt on the life of Moses or their son, Zipporah determines that she can save Moses or the son through circumcision. This preserves two possible explanations for the circumcision (deduced by Zipporah) derived from Ambrosiaster: 1) God plans to kill Moses because he had not circumcised the child or 2) God intends to kill the child because an uncircumcised child might delegitimize Moses' authority among the Israelites. The Vulgate does not preclude the pagan reading of the verse but allows for more interpretive possibilities.⁶⁸

5. Exod 9:20

MT הִירָא אֶת־דָּבָר יְהוָה מֵעַבְדֵי פֶרְעָה הַנִּים אֶת־עַבְדָּיו וְאֶת־מִקְנֵהוּ אֶל־הַבָּתִּים

IH *qui timuit verbum Domini de servis Pharaonis, facit confugere servos suos et iumenta in domos.*

It is not unusual to render the causative *hif'il* הִנִּים periphrastically, as in this case with *fecit confugere*.⁶⁹ Combining Hebrew and Septuagintal scholarship, the periphrasis reflects awareness of the Hebrew causative form and follows the *con-* of the LXX συνηγαγεν and VL *congregavit*. *Confugere* is most closely related semantically to σ' δέσσωσεν. What is striking, however, is the possibility of a Classical exegetical tradition underlying this formulation. For the rendition emphatically refutes the accusation of pagans like Celsus (ap. Origen, *Cels.* v 59)⁷⁰ that the Israelites ignobly *fled* from Egypt.⁷¹ By taking this opportunity to describe the Egyptians as fleeing, Jerome emphasizes that *only* the Egyptians flee in the Exodus story.⁷² Even though Exodus 14:5 refers to a flight of the Israelites—*et nuntiatur regi Aegyptiorum quod fugisset populus* 'and it was announced to the king of the Egyptians that the people have fled')—the context as well as the subjunctive of *ex alia mente* underscore that

68 It is possible that the pagan question is based on Jerome's version and so the rendition need not be a response to the pagan's interpretation. At issue here, however, is understanding the translation in a Classical context, so at the least we have a rendition that interacts with a pagan worldview.

69 William E. Plater and H. J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926) §27.

70 "Ενθα μὲν οὖν ᾤετο χλευάσειν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν Ἑβραίων λόγῳ, φυγῆν ὠνόμαζεν 'Where, therefore, he thinks to mock us in his account of the Hebrews, he labels it "flight."' (Rinaldi, *Biblia Gentium*, 272).

71 According to this old pagan tradition, the Jews were expelled from Egypt because they contracted a disease; see Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences, 1974), 2:35.

72 As in Exod 14:25 and Exod 14:27.

they flee only according to the perceptions of the Egyptians.⁷³ Therefore, in response to the pagan critique, Jerome highlights the Egyptians' flight and the Israelites' lack of cowardice.

6. Exod 16:15

- MT וַיֵּרְאוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ אֶל־אָחִיו מֶן הוּא כִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ מַה־הוּא וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה
 אֲלֵהֶם הוּא הַלֶּחֶם אֲשֶׁר נָתַן יְהוָה לָכֶם לֶאֱכֹלָה
 IH *quod cum vidissent filii Israël, dixerunt ad invicem: Manhu? quod significat: Quid est hoc? ignorabant enim quid esset. Quibus ait Moyses: Iste est panis quem Dominus dedit vobis ad vescendum.*

In the account of manna, Jerome, in comparison with the Septuagint, manifestly seeks to clarify the pun in מַה־הוּא... מֶן הוּא. LXX (ἐἴπαι...) Τί ἐστίν τοῦτο; οὐ γὰρ ᾔδεισαν, τί γινώσκει follows the Hebrew “The Israelites saw it and said to each other ‘Man hu’ because they did not know what it was.” In contrast, the Vg has a significant addition: *man hu quod significat quid est hoc ignorabant enim quid esset* ‘they said “man hu” which means “what is this?” for they did not know what it was.’ The addition clearly points to an etymological reading of manna. That is, the translation not only renders puns, it also explicitly announces the presence of puns. A pagan influence may underlie this rendition because the unintelligibility of manna plays an essential role in the defense of Ps 77:25. The anonymous pagan, citing the psalm, asks: “what does it mean when it says ‘man eats the bread of angels’; since angels do not need food for are they not simple in nature and flourish through spiritual sustenance?”⁷⁴ After connecting the bread of angels (*panis angelorum*) to manna, Ambrosiaster includes in his response the argument that, since the Hebrew translation of the term means that manna was unknown, it was not created by the law of the world through a mixture of elements. Rather, it was made in a “spiritual manner” (*spiritualis ratio*). Thus, Jerome’s emphasis on the unintelligibility of manna supports the contention that it possessed a spiritual nature, transcending human understanding.

73 Even in the Golden Calf incident, Jerome refuses to attribute flight to the Israelites: *neque vociferatio conpellentium ad fugam... ego audio* ‘Nor the cry of those putting them to flight do I hear’ (Exod 32:18).

74 *Quid est quod dicit: ‘panem angelorum manducavit homo’; cum angeli non egeant cibo, quippe cum sint natura simplices et potentia spiritali vigentes?* (*Quaestiones Veteris* 20). Even if the interlocutor was not a pagan, the rationalist tone and the identification of an apparent logical inconsistency reflects pagan influence.

7. Exod 20:5

- MT כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל קָנָא פָקֵד עַן אֲבֹת עַל-בָּנִים עַל-שְׁלֹשִׁים וְעַל-רִבְעִים לְשָׁנָיִם
- IH *ego sum Dominus Deus tuus fortis, zelotes, visitans iniquitatem patrum in filios, in tertiam et quartam generationem eorum qui oderunt me*
- LXX ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου, Θεὸς ζηλωτής, ἀποδιδούς ἀμαρτίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα, ἕως τρίτης καὶ τετάρτης γενεᾶς τοῖς μισοῦσί με.

At first glance, the Latin appears to be a simple interpretation of the Hebrew similar to the Septuagint. However, although *zelotes* transliterates LXX ζηλωτής, *visitans* does not precisely agree with *reddo*/ἀποδιδούς. For *visitans* means ‘punishing’ or ‘paying back’ only in a Christian context. In Classical Latin, *visitans* generally means ‘see’ or ‘go to see’.⁷⁵ Since *zelotes* can mean ‘zealous’ as well as ‘jealous’,⁷⁶ *zelotes visitans* could indicate that God zealously keeps observing the sins of fathers in their children who hate God. This reading becomes more intelligible in relation to the pagan critique expressed both by Emperor Julian (*Galil.* 106d–e) and the anonymous interlocutor in *Quaestiones Veteris* 14.⁷⁷ The interlocutor asks, “Why is it that God, who is called just, promises to punish the sons for the sins of the fathers up to the third and fourth generation?”⁷⁸ Jerome’s version responds by suggesting that, because God examines so carefully—in other words, zealously—God is able to perceive residual evil up to the fourth generation of those who hate God. God justly punishes the subsequent generations because a careful judge can see the iniquity being transmitted.

6.3.3 *Latinizations*

In addition to the influence of specific interpretations from a Classical tradition on the *iuxta Hebraeos*, the general Classical weltanschauung had an impact on it. The renderings considered here should be distinguished from those in chapters 2 and 3 which reflect the interaction between the Latin and Hebrew language with all their grammatical constraints. Here I examine those renderings not necessarily demanded by the Hebrew, but whose primary interpretive significance lies in their effect on the late antique Latin reader. Since Jerome was a keen student of the Latin language and Roman history, he would

75 “*visitans*,” LS. According to ancient grammarians, *visitare* would belong to the frequentative form of *videre*; see Donatus, *Ars Minor* 4.

76 “ζηλωτής,” LSJ s.v.

77 Rinaldi, *Biblia Gentium*, 276–77.

78 *Quid est ut Deus, qui iustus praedicatur, peccata patrum filiis se reddere promiserit in tertiam et quartam progeniem?* (*Quaestiones Veteris* 14).

be well aware of the implications of his rendition in a Classical Latin context. Moreover, I submit that his translation can be read strictly as a Latin text.⁷⁹ That is, one Classical approach to the *iuxta Hebraeos* reads the text with the eyes of a reader who knows only Latin (or at least does not know the Greek Bible). These renditions fall into three categories: motifs developed through verbal repetition that appear in the *iuxta Hebraeos* and not in the Hebrew itself—such motifs appear especially in instances where Jerome avoids *variatio* present in the Hebrew; idioms and technical terms with particular meanings in the Latin semantic field; and particular meanings in a fourth–fifth century Classical or late antique context. I include a Latin reading of the *iuxta Hebraeos* under the rubric of Classical interpretation because Jerome’s Latinity derives primarily from the Classical rather than Christian tradition.⁸⁰

6.3.3.1 Biblical Intertextuality

Although Jerome prefers *variatio*, in the case of *dimittere* ‘release’, the opposite occurs, for he renders different Hebrew words with the same Latin word. At the burning bush, God explains that Pharaoh will not release the Israelites: *non dimittet vos . . . ut eatis* ‘he will not release you . . . so that you may go’ for both לְהֵלֵךְ . . . יִתֵּן ‘give, allow . . . to go’ (Exod 3:19) and יִשְׁלַח ‘he will send’ (Exod 3:20).⁸¹ This has the literary impact of highlighting the motif of release. The Septuagint has a different rendition for all three words. Exod 9:21 continues this theme with the rendering of וַיַּעַזְבֵהוּ ‘and he abandoned’ with *dimisit*, although this does follow VL and LXX ἀφῆκεν. In the context of 9:21, those who ignore God send (*dimisit*) their slaves and flocks into the field where they are subsequently afflicted by hail. The use of *dimittere* heightens the irony of the situation by contrasting the Egyptians’ refusal to release the Israelites with their willingness to release their own slaves and herds to a disastrous result. Similarly, the use of *dimittes* to render תִּשְׁמַטְנָה ‘you shall let lie fallow’ (Exod 23:11) recalls the Exodus terminology—every seven years the Israelites must do to the land what Pharaoh had refused to do for them.⁸²

This is not the only example of a literary motif emphasized in the Latin. Both the Egyptians and Israelites express regret in the same language. The Egyptians

79 Tkacz, “*Labor tam utilis*,” 42.

80 Of course Jerome had read Tertullian and Hilary, but these writers influenced Jerome’s content. His style and his literary sensibility depends on his Classical background.

81 At the beginning of Exod 3:20, Jerome renders וַיִּשְׁלַחְתִּי with *extendam*, which fits the context of God promising to punish the Egyptians.

82 Similarly, he avoids *variatio* in Exod 4:18–21 for the four instances of בָּרַח, which he regularly renders as *revertere*, thereby highlighting the theme of returning.

question why they let the Israelites leave with the words “what did we intend to do?” (*quid voluimus facere?*) The Hebrew מִהֲזָאת עָשִׂינוּ literally means ‘what is this we did’ (Exod 14:5), and the Israelites a few verses later (Exod 14:11) also say *quid hoc facere voluisti* ‘why did you intend to do this (also for מִהֲזָאת עָשִׂיתָ)’. Jerome thus notes a parallel between the Egyptians rebuking themselves for letting the Israelites leave and the Israelites rebuking Moses for letting them leave.⁸³ The use of the same Latin for a different Hebrew word can also generate an intertextual relationship between legal and narrative materials. The *exactor* in Exod 22:2 (נֹשֵׂא ‘creditor’ MT 22:24) alludes to the Egyptian *exactores* in 5:6 (שֹׁטְרִים), thereby suggesting that the Israelites must avoid being like their Egyptian oppressors when collecting loans.

6.3.3.2 Technical Vocabulary

Translators can use contemporary terminology. These technical terms include idiomatic Latin as well as vocabulary with specific meanings significantly different from the Hebrew and versions. Thus, such terminology reflects the semantic influence of the target language on the translator, albeit imperceptibly to the reader. The reader would be unaware whether latinization represents a radical interpretive transformation of the Hebrew or minor adjustment to the literal sense. For example, *qui liberavit vos de manu Aegyptiorum, et de manu Pharaonis; qui eruit populum suum de manu Aegypti* (Exod 18:10) literally follows the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר הִצִּיל אֶתְּכֶם מִיַּד מִצְרַיִם וּמִיַּד פַּרְעֹה אֲשֶׁר הִצִּיל אֶת־הָעָם מִיַּד־מִצְרַיִם מִתַּחַת יַד־מִצְרַיִם ‘who saved you from the hand of Egypt and from the hand of Pharaoh; who saved the people from the land of Egypt’. Nevertheless, the variation of הִצִּיל with *liberare* and the use of *de manu* suggests the technical vocabulary for freeing slaves.⁸⁴ In the case of Exod 4:12, a literal translation of the Hebrew involves a specific idiom in Latin. For Exod 4:12 אֶהְיֶה עִם־פִּיךָ ‘I will be with your mouth’, Jerome renders word for word with *ero in ore tuo* ‘I will be in your mouth’, a Latin idiom for constantly talking about someone,

83 It is true that the Hebrew phrase is repeated in both verses, but the avoidance of *variatio* with the repeated periphrastic rendition of עָשָׂה as *facere velle* indicates an intent to connect the two verses.

84 For *libero* as the technical term for free from slavery see LS “*libero*.” For *de manu* (with *mitto*) meaning freeing a slave, see “*manus*,” OLD 17b. In 18:8 Jerome renders הִצִּיל ‘save’ as *liberaret*. Exod 18:9 has *eruisset eum de manu* for הִצִּילוֹ מִיַּד. In Exod 3:8, *ut liberarem eum de manibus Aegyptiorum*, *liberarem* is the rendering for הִצִּיל. The singular *manu*, however, would be more idiomatic as in Exod 14:30 *liberavitque . . . de manu*. Perhaps *manibus* should be understood distributively, i.e., referring to a number of individual Egyptians who owned slaves.

in other words, 'you will always be talking about me.'⁸⁵ Exod 5:6 exemplifies a specific technical Latin term for the more general Hebrew. In this verse, the officials overseeing the Israelites as they built the storage cities of Pithom and Rameses, הַנִּגְשִׁים בָּעַם וְאֶת־שֹׁטְרֵי 'the oppressors of the people and its officers', become *praefecti operum* 'officers of works' and *exactores* [*populi*] 'tax collectors'.⁸⁶ The late antique official *praefectus operum* (*publicorum* or *maximorum*) supervised public buildings,⁸⁷ and *praefectus* with *operum* is attested in an inscription found in a Nile River stone quarry.⁸⁸ *Exactor*, although technically a tax collector, can more generally refer to a work supervisor.⁸⁹

This careful application of technical terminology can have exegetical implications, a point manifest through comparative analysis of Exod 5:14 and 5:19:

8. Exod 5:14

MT וַיִּכּוּ שֹׁטְרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר־שָׂמוּ עֲלֵהֶם נֹגְשֵׁי פְרָעָה

And the supervisors of the Israelites, whom Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them, were beaten

IH *flagellatique sunt qui praeerant operibus filiorum Israël, ab exactoribus Pharaonis*

LXX καὶ ἐμαστιγώθησαν οἱ γραμματεῖς τοῦ γένους τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, οἱ κατασταθέντες ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιστατῶν τοῦ Φαραώ

85 "Os," LS cites Terence and Cicero. The LXX/VL interprets the ambiguous Hebrew less literally than Jerome. VL reads *aperiam os tuum* 'I will open your mouth' like the LXX.

86 *Praefecti operum* comes from LXX ἐργασδοῦνται which represents נֹגְשִׁים and שׁוֹטְרִים *exactores* comes from γραμματεῖς, which represents שׁוֹטְרִים. *Praefecti operum* is also the rendition for נֹגְשֵׁי עַם in Exod 5:10 and נֹגְשִׁים in 5:13. Similarly, *praepositi filiorum Israel* for שֹׁטְרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in Exod 5:15.

87 A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire: 284–602* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 691. Although *praefectus operum* is attested, the more common term is *consularis operum*.

88 CIL III 75 (Philae, 203 CE). See J. F. Gilliam, *Roman Army Papers*, Mavors Roman Army Researches, 2 (Amsterdam: Gieben 1986), 110 n. 3. The full text of the inscription describes the supervisors of the stone quarry as the *praefectus Aegypti* and a *decurio* acting as *curam agente operis*: *Subatiano Aquila{e} pr(aefecto) / Aeg(ypti) curam agente op(eris) d[io]minic(i) / Aurel(io) Heraclida{e} dec(urione) al(ae) Maur(orurum)*. The *decurio* is a soldier stationed at the quarry. While the inscription does not attest to *praefectus operum* as a term for an Egyptian official supervising a building project, it does demonstrate that Jerome uses a term that sounds like a roman military officer overseeing construction.

89 "Exactor," LS.

Exod 5:19

- MT וַיֵּרְאוּ שְׂטָרֵי בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֹתָם בָּרַע לְאֹמֶר לֹא-תִגְרְעוּ מִלְּבִנְיָכֶם דְּבַר-יְיָ בְּיוֹמוֹ
 The Israelite supervisors saw that they were in trouble **when they were told**, “You shall not lessen your daily number of bricks.”
- IH *videbantque se praepositi filiorum Israel in malo, eo quod diceretur eis: Non minuetur quidquam de lateribus per singulos dies.*
- LXX ἑώρων δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἑαυτοὺς ἐν κακοῖς λέγοντες Οὐκ ἀπολείψετε τῆς πλινθείας τὸ καθήκον τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

Jerome's rendition of Exod 5:14 differs from the Hebrew (and Greek) by having the “officers of the Israelites” (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל/*qui praeerant operibus filiorum Israel*) beaten by the “tax collectors of Pharaoh” (פְּרָעֹה נִגְשֵׁי/exactores Pharaonis). The Hebrew and Greek indicate that the officers of the Israelites (who were beaten) were appointed by these *exactores* (אֲשֶׁר־שָׂמוּ עֲלֵהֶם נִגְשֵׁי/exactores/οἱ κατασταθέντες ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιστατῶν τοῦ Φαραώ). In addition, it is not completely clear which officials are Egyptians and which are Israelites collaborating with Egyptians.⁹⁰ In either case, while it is unclear in Exod 5:6 whether the *exactores populi* ‘officials of the people’ refer to Egyptians specifically responsible for Israelites or Israelites who managed their people on behalf of the Egyptians, both *praefectus operum* and *exactor populi* describe two distinct types of officials. In Vg Exod 5:16–17, it becomes quite clear that the *qui praeerant operibus* are Israelites since Pharaoh responds to them in verse 17, “you are idle because of leisure and for this reason you say ‘let us go sacrifice to God’” (*vacatis otio*⁹¹ *et idcirco dicitis eamus et sacrificemus Domino*). Distinguishing between two types of officials helps explain Jerome's

90 E.g., if we read *populi* in *exactores populi* (Exod 5:6) as a genitive of source or description rather than objective genitive, Jerome could be following Jewish tradition that the officers, or tax collectors, were Israelites (Tanḥ. Beha'alotecha 13, Num. Rab. 15.20, Exod. Rab. 5.18). Unfavorable references to Jewish tax collectors in rabbinic literature testify to their existence in late antiquity; see Daniel Sperber, “Tax Gatherers,” *EncJud* 20:558–59.

91 It is striking that the negative effects of *otium* evoke the famous concluding stanza of Catullus 51:

otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est:
otio exsultas nimiumque gestis.
otium et reges prius et beatas.
perdidit urbes.

Idleness, Catullus, does you harm,
 you riot in your idleness and wanton too much.

Idleness ere now has ruined both kings and wealthy cities (*Cat.* 51 [Ware and Goold, LCL]).

unique rendition of Exod 5:14. Egyptian officials (*exactores Pharaonis*) beat the Israelite officials (*qui praeerant operibus*), something more plausible than a reference to Egyptian work supervisors who appointed Israelite officials.⁹² This point also becomes crucial in the understanding of Exod 5:19. For Jerome and the Septuagint disagree on how to render the infinitive לֹא־מָר 'the officers of the Israelites saw themselves in trouble) saying ("do not lessen from the daily bricks"). According to the Septuagint, the officials see themselves in a difficult situation and therefore order their fellow Israelites to meet their regular quota of bricks despite the fact that they will no longer be given straw. By rendering לֹא־מָר with a participle, the Septuagint makes the officials the speakers and the Israelites the recipients of the command. Jerome reads the text differently, with the officials considering themselves in difficulty because they were told not to lessen the daily brick quota: "those in charge of the Israelites continued to see [*videbant*] themselves in trouble because it was told to them: 'nothing shall be lessened from amount of bricks for each day.'" He does follow the Septuagint's use of the reflexive which is neither demanded nor precluded by the Hebrew. But by having the *praepositi filiorum Israhel* receive the command, he groups these officials with the Israelites. Thus, to Jerome, the officials suffer evil because of the command to maintain the brick quota, whereas to the Septuagint they respond to their bad situation by commanding the Israelites to maintain the brick quota. And the use of the imperfect "continued to see themselves" (*videbant se*) makes sense as a reference to 5:16 where they were beaten by the Egyptian officials. The use of more specific technical terms such as *exactores*, *praefecti*, and *praepositi* instead of the more general Hebrew 'officials' and 'oppressors' enable Jerome to demonstrate how the Israelite officers change from collaborators to victims.⁹³

9. Additional examples of idiomatic Latin and technical terms:

iste in its derogatory sense (Exod 32:8–9): Although Hebrew has one word for "these," the Israelites say of the Golden Calf "*hii sunt dii tui Israhel...*" 'these are your gods, Israel' while God quotes to Moses the Israelites saying "*isti sunt dii tui Israhel...*" The pejorative connotation of *isti* fits here, a point not

92 נִגְשֵׁי פָרְעֹה 'the oppressors of Pharaoh' (*exactores Pharaonis*) could be the same as the *exactores populi* of Exod 5:6, but there is no need to connect the two. It is equally plausible that the *exactores populi* are included with the *qui praeerant operibus*.

93 I am not suggesting that Jerome is responding to the Septuagint in his reading of the passage. Rather, comparison with the Septuagint highlights the specific way this text would be understood in Latin.

detected by the Vetus Latina, which reads *hi* in both verses. There could be a theological problem in God saying “*hi sunt dii*” even as a quotation. Similarly, in the next verse, God refers to the Israelites as *populus iste* ‘this people’ (*cerno quod populus iste durae cervicis sit*). Similarly, in Exod 5:22, Moses, annoyed at the Israelites’ complaints, says to God “*cur afflixisti populum istum*,” ‘why did you afflict this people’ unlike VL *quare afflixisti populum hunc*.

eloquens (Exod 4:14): The Septuagint and *iuxta Hebraeos* give a completely different interpretation of יְדַבֵּר הוּא בְּיַדְּךָ ‘(I [God] know) that he [Aaron] will speak’ (4:14), for LXX has ὅτι λαλῶν λαλήσει αὐτός σοι ‘that speaking he will speak for you’ (with σοι being an addition to the Hebrew) while Jerome translates it as *quod eloquens sit* ‘because he is eloquent’. Thus, the Septuagint, in accurately rendering the Hebrew verbs, implies nothing about Aaron’s qualifications except perhaps that he is Moses’ brother and a Levite, whereas Jerome is interested in contrasting Aaron’s rhetorical abilities with Moses’ rhetorical inadequacy.

indurabo cor (Exod 4:21): Jerome’s rendition of the famous אֶחָזְקֶנּוּ אֶת־לִבּוֹ ‘I will harden his [Pharaoh’s] heart’ (4:21) with *indurabo cor eius* ‘I will harden his heart’ allows three possible interpretations for the exact meaning of “harden one’s heart”: God will make Pharaoh insensitive to the Israelites, God will make Pharaoh insensitive to the suffering of his own people, or God will make Pharaoh stupid. Now Jerome probably accepts the Vetus Latina’s rendering (which is preserved for 7:3). However, it is interesting to note that the various Greek versions favor each possibility. σ’ θρασύνω, if taken in its negative sense of rashness, points to Pharaoh’s hard-headedness while the positive connotations of α’ θ’ ἐνισχύνω, although not a Stoic term per se, suggests the endurance of his people’s suffering. LXX σκληρυνῶ τὴν καρδίαν, although a peculiarly Septuagintal collocation, could be interpreted as insensitivity to Israelite suffering.

peregrinatio (Exod 6:4): The *variatio* in *terram peregrinationis eorum in qua fuerunt advenae* for אֶרֶץ מִגְרֵיהֶם אֲשֶׁר־גָּרוּ בָּהּ ‘the land of their [Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob] dwelling in which they dwelled’ highlights the technical sense of *peregrinus* as free men under Roman rule not having citizenship. Jerome accurately describes the political status of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in Roman terms.

ergastulum (Exod 6:6): *Ergastulum* in *educam vos de ergastulo Aegyptiorum* for מִתַּחַת סְבִלַת מִצְרַיִם ‘I will take you out) from beneath the burdens of the

Egyptian' refers to "a kind of prison on a large estate to which refractory or unpliant slaves were sent to work in a chain gang" (*OLD*, "*ergastulum*"). It is striking that the *Vetus Latina* (following the Septuagint) also renders the Hebrew inexactly, albeit with a different term, *de potentia Aegyptiorum*. *Ergastulum* appears again in Exod 6:7.

malefici (Exod 7:11): This popular term for magi ("*malefici*," LS 1.B.1) depicts Pharaoh's counsellors as magicians.

coluber . . . dracones (Exod 7:10, 12): Rather than another case of *variatio* in the rendering of תָּנִין, since Aaron's snake swallows the Egyptian snakes, the context clearly differentiates between them. Targum Yerushalmi also varies the words.

villae (Exod 8:13; MT 8:9): For חֲצֵרוֹת 'courtyards'. The frogs entered even the houses of the countryside. LXX has ἐπαύλεις 'farm buildings, military quarters, unwallled villages'.

plebs (Exod 11:2): In contrast to VL *populi* 'the people, the nation', Jerome has Moses address *omnis plebs* 'all the common people' (Exod 11:2) whose Latin connotation fits the context of the despoliation of the Egyptians in that the command to despoil them is directed to the entire Israelite citizenry rather than simply the elders. Of course the use of *populo* in Exod 11:3 could mean that Jerome is only interested in *variatio*. In Exod 18:14, *plebs* fits the political character of the context: the *plebs* (for עַם 'people') await (*praestolatur* for נֶצֶב 'situated') Moses from morning to night in order for him to adjudicate disputes.

amicus/vicina (Exod 11:2): The Israelite male (*vir*) requests items from his friend (*amicus*), whereas the Israelite female (*mulier*) addresses her neighbor (*vicina*). In contrast, LXX τοῦ πλησίον/τῆς πλησίον and VL *proximo/proxima* do not vary the רֵעֵהוּ/רֵעֵתָה 'his neighbor/her neighbor'. While this could be a simple case of *variatio*, a Latin reader would notice that the relationship between male Israelites and Egyptians is of a different order than that between female Israelites and Egyptians. A starting point could be that רֵעֵתָה is not exactly the feminine form of the masculine רֵעֵהוּ although they share the same root.

familia/domus (Exod 12:3): Since *familia* 'household slaves' is distinct from *domus*, the Latin term for the modern notion of family, VL *ovem per domos familiarum, ovem per singulas domos* for שֶׁה לְבֵית־אָבֹתָה שֶׁה לְבֵיתָה 'a lamb for the house of the fathers, a lamb for the house' (following LXX and MT) would not

make sense. For *familia* cannot modify *domus* nor can they put in apposition. Jerome resolves this problem by making a distinction between the “house of the fathers” and the “house” by adding an *et* and eliminating *patres*, reading (*tollat unusquisque*) *agnum per familias et domos suas*. There must be a lamb for every collection of slaves and for every Israelite family. Here he is appropriating and adapting VL. VL’s *Vorlage*, LXX κατ’ οἰκους πατριῶν follows the Hebrew ‘father’, but the use of *familia* in VL *domos familiarum* introduces the technical Latin term for the household slaves.⁹⁴

aedes (Exod 12:13): *Aedes* ‘apartment’ for הַבֵּתִים ‘the homes’, unlike the versions, indicates that the Israelites lived in modest dwellings. It is more likely that the enslaved Israelites would live in apartments rather palatial homes.

vulgus promiscuum animantia diversi generis (Exod 12:38): In *sed et vulgus promiscuum innumerabile ascendit cum eis oves et armenta et animantia diversi generis multa nimis* for מֵאֲדָר וְגַם-עֶרֶב רַב עִלָּה אֲתָם וְצֹאן וּבָקָר מִקְנֶה כְּבֵד מְאֹד ‘and also an abundant mixture went up with them and sheep and cattle, a very heavy possession’ the addition of *vulgus* clarifies that עֶרֶב refers to people rather than animals while *promiscuum* specifies that the *vulgus* was a mixture of classes (as opposed to other mixtures). The periphrastic rendering of מִקְנֶה with *animantia diversi generis* does not logically follow from the text.

pulmentum (Exod 12:39): The unique rendition of צֶדֶה ‘(and they did not make) provisions’ (12:39) with (*nec*) *pulmenti* (*quicquam occurrerant praeparare*) creates an almost trivial situation because *pulmentum* refers to a relish for dipping bread.

columna ignis (Exod 13:21): Following the *Vetus Latina*, this refers to a meteor (Seneca, *Nat.* 7.20.2).

similae cum melle (Exod 16:31): *Simila* ‘fine wheat’ and *mel* ‘honey’ are associated with luxury according to Jerome’s *Epist.* 52.6.3: *natus in paupere domo et in tugurio rusticano, qui vix milio et cibario pane rugientem saturare ventrem poteram, nunc similam et mella fastidio* ‘I who was born (suppose) in a poor man’s house, in a country cottage, and who could scarcely get of common millet and household bread enough to fill an empty stomach, am now come to

94 On Jerome’s interest in conveying the various nuances of בֵּית, see Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 114.

disdain the finest wheat flour and honey.⁹⁵ By using these terms to describe manna, we can see that Jerome understands this heavenly food to have a gourmet flavor.

mansio (Exod 17:1): The more specific *per mansiones* for מְסָעֵיהֶם ‘by their journeyings’ (VL *per castra sua*) refers to the night quarters or measure of a day’s journey (“*mansio*,” LS).

tribunus/centurio/decanus (Exod 18:21): In rendering the Hebrew of 18:21 “officers over thousands, officers over hundreds, officers over fifties, and officers over tens,” Jerome, unlike the versions, utilizes technical vocabulary in describing whom Jethro advises Moses to appoint in order to adjudicate civil cases (as opposed to cultic issues *quae ad Deum pertinent* ‘which pertain to God’ [18:19]): *provide autem de omni plebe viros potentes et timentes Deum in quibus sit veritas et qui oderint avaritiam et constitue ex eis tribunos et centuriones et quinquagenarios et decanos*. Only *quinquagenarios* is a biblical term while *decanus* can refer to an officer at the imperial court or a military officer.

bucina (Exod 19:13): For הַיָּבֹל ‘trumpet’. Although both *bucina* ‘trumpet’ and the Greek σάλπιγξ (LXX and perhaps σ’) belong to a military context, the σάλπιγξ was used to start the battle while the *bucina* marked the divisions of night and day, a meaning more relevant to the biblical context. In Exod 19:16 Jerome’s *bucina* is the rendition of a different Hebrew word, שֹׁפָר ‘shofar’.

culter (Exod 20:22): In 20:22, the Hebrew for ‘your sword’ receives various renderings: Vg *culter*, LXX ἐγχειρίδιον, α’/σ’ μάχαιραν, θ’ ῥομφαίαν, and perhaps *ferrum* in the VL tradition. The context is important as well: the word in question describes the types of instrument forbidden to be used when building an altar. For the altar must be built from uncut stones. Jerome’s *culter* does not fit this context but refers to a knife used for sacrifice. Therefore, his rendition is closest to α’ and σ’ because μάχαιρα is the knife utilized in a Greek sacrifice. LXX and θ’ may refer to an implement for hewing stone, since ἐγχειρίδιον can describe a tool, and the ῥομφαία, a large Thracian sword, certainly could cut through stone. Ambiguity in the Hebrew further complicates the situation: כִּי תִרְבֹּךְ הַנֶּפֶת עָלֶיָּהּ וְתַחֲלֹלָהּ can be read either ‘because you waved your sword upon it (f.) and you rendered it (f.) impure’ or ‘and it (f.) rendered it (f.) impure’. The problem emerges from the fact that תַּחֲלֹלָהּ could have a 2ms or 3fs subject and there are two feminine singular antecedents for the pronominal suffixes, hewn stone

95 Translation from Fremantle NPNF 2.6 p.92.

and sword (whose morphology actually suggests a masculine form). Jerome reads *super eo* as referring to the altar (or the feminine 'hewn stone') with LXX and the versions. Thus, the whole verse, *quod si altare lapideum feceris mihi non aedificabis illud de sectis lapidibus si enim levaveris cultrum tuum super eo polluetur*, indicates that using your sacrificial knife over an altar made from hewn stone makes the knife impure. However, the versions do not preserve the rest of the verse, while LXX suggests that the stones would be impure.

propitiatorium/oraculum (Exod 25:17–18): The rendering of כִּפֹּרֶת 'covering' (25:17–18) as *propitiatorium* and *oraculum* cannot be explained as a case of *variatio* because the terms are not synonymous. Nevertheless, both renderings can be considered appropriate since *propitiatorium* etymologically renders כִּפֹּר 'atonement' while *oraculum*, the place where an oracular response is given, accurately describes the space between the two cherubim (*duos quoque cherubin aureos et productiles facies ex utraque parte oraculi*) because God speaks between the cherubim (25:22). Thus, the *variatio* here captures the two different functions of the כִּפֹּרֶת. Exod 37:6 creates a problem since Jerome renders the phrase with a gloss: *fecit et propitiatorium id est oraculum*. However, a term can be an alternative without being synonymous. Thus, *oraculum* could be a metonym for *propitiatorium*.

tabernaculum (Exod 26:1): For מִשְׁכָּן 'tent'. *Tabernaculum* in a religious context refers to a tent outside the city where the auspices are observed prior to holding the *comitia* 'political assembly' (Cicero, *Div.* 2.35.75).

lamina (Exod 26:29): The addition of *lamina* in *operies laminis aureis* clarifies, in light of the artistic processes of the time, that the carrying poles are to be covered in gold leaf.

altare (Exod 27:1): *Altare* in contrast to *ara* refers to a higher and more splendid structure. The neuter singular instead of *altaria* is a postclassical usage. See "*altaria*," LS.

initio (Exod 29:9): *Initio* in (*eruntque sacerdotes mei in religione perpetua postquam initiaveris manus eorum* '(they will be my priests in perpetual service) after you initiate their hands' for וּמְלֵאֲתָ יָד 'they will have the priesthood forever) and you will fill the hand of (Aaron and the hand of his sons)' (Exod 29:9) not only technically refers to initiation into a group, but in late Latin specifically refers to baptism ("*initio*," LS). Moreover, Jerome's clause connector *postquam* indicates logically that the initiation comes before the possession

of the priesthood. However, since the Hebrew “filling the hand” comes afterwards in the verse, the Hebrew, according to the more literal reading, indicates that the initiation occurs after entering the perpetual priesthood. Thus, *initia-veris* is an interpretive move against the *lectio facilior* of the Hebrew. Although the technical character of *initia-veris* probably derives from LXX τελειώσεις, the Greek term refers to the completion of the process, while the collocation with hands in the Latin is unusual. In Exod 29:26 and 28 Jerome renders the noun form of the Hebrew “(ram) of initiation” (*ariete*) *quo initiatus est* (Aaron). Finally, Jerome introduces paranomasia into the Hebrew (and Greek) when he reads in Exod 29:28 *quo initiatus est Aaron . . . quia primitiva sunt et initia de victimis*. Since he renders here the more general תְּרוּמָה ‘offering’ as *initia* (and its first appearance in the verse as *primitiva*), he emphasizes that the passage describes an initiation rite. Although this is certainly the obvious sense of the section, Jerome blurs the distinction between the initiation of priests and the initiation of individuals into a religious group.

tabulae (Exod 34:4): In rendering לַחֹת הַאֲבִנִּים, the tablets of stone which God inscribes and gives to Moses, as *tabulae lapideae* ‘stone tablets’ (as in Deut 9:11), Jerome employs the term associated with the foundation of Roman law, the Twelve Tablets (*xii tabulae*) (Cicero, *Rep.* 2.31.54.). While LXX τὰ πύξια and τὰς πλάκας in the Greek versions do not use technical terms here, at the end of the verse, LXX’s rendition νομοθετῆσαι for “to instruct them” may have suggested to Jerome to utilize terminology associated with Classical lawgiving traditions. It should be noted, however, that unlike the Hebrew and versions, Jerome renders the infinitive לְהוֹרֹתָם ‘(which I [God] have written) to instruct them’ as *ut doceas eos*. Not only does Jerome follow σ’ ὑποδεξάσαι, he also makes Moses the subject, which is the *lectio difficilior*. Thus, Jerome still employs the lawgiving motif but in a way closer to the Hebrew.⁹⁶

turba/caterva (Exod 35:1, 4): At first glance the different renderings of עֵדָה ‘congregation’ as *turba* ‘crowd’ and *caterva* ‘throng’, respectively, represent a typical case of *variatio*. However, the negative connotation of both words identifies the average Israelites as a kind of mob. LXX/VL has *synagoga*, which Jerome used in Exod 34:31 in reference to the *principes* ‘chiefs’.

96 For a discussion of pagan traditions about Moses the lawgiver, see John G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972), 25–112.

6.3.4 *Classical and Late Antique Context*

Just as technical or idiomatic Latin produces in the reader a particularly late antique understanding of an individual word, so too do intertextual relationships between the IH and Classical and late antique literature. The following examples depend on the broader context of a rendition as opposed to the lexical definition of an individual term in order to determine its impact on the reader. Also included are examples that might confound the reader, not because the Latin is unclear, but the contextual meaning would be unusual.

6.3.4.1 Recognition or Revelation?

Introducing the account of the ten plagues in Exod 7:3 (*sed ego indurabo cor ejus, et multiplicabo signa et ostenta mea in terra Aegypti*), Jerome deploys the polyvalent possibilities of *signa* and *ostenta*. *Signa* can refer to tokens used in a recognition scene (ἀναγνώρισις) common in Greek tragedy, while *ostenta*, according to Cicero, reveal future events.⁹⁷ Exod 7:5 confirms this interpretation of *signa* by claiming that these ‘signs’ will enable the Egyptians to recognize God’s identity (*scient Aegyptii quod ego sim Dominus . . .*). Exod 11:9–10 offers another angle on this issue: “Pharaoh will not heed you so that my signs (*signa*/מוֹפְתִים) become many in the land of Egypt.’ Moses and Aaron, however, produced all the portents (*ostenta*/מוֹפְתִים) which were written before Pharaoh.”⁹⁸ He seems to simply vary the rendition of מוֹפְתִים with *signa* in 11:9 and *ostenta* 11:10, but two peculiarities suggest something deeper: In 11:9, God is the author of the wondrous acts (“my signs,” although *iuxta Hebraeos* does not render the “my”), whereas the human beings Moses and Aaron perform the “portents” in 11:10. *Autem* ‘however’ highlights this contrast between divine and human actions. In 11:10, Jerome adds the unusual gloss *quae scripta sunt* ‘which things were written’, apparently a rendering of הָאֵלֶּה ‘these’. Attention to the connotations of *signa* and *ostenta* can account for the rendition. *Signa* belong to God, as they reveal God’s identity to the ignorant, typical of a recognition scene. *Ostenta* represent prophetic omens performed by human beings. Thus

97 Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.3.7 *praedictiones vero et praesensiones rerum futurarum quid aliud nisi hominibus ea quae futura sunt ostendi, monstrari, portendi, praedici? Ex quo illa ostenta, monstra, portenta, prodigia dicuntur.* On *signa*, see Terence, *Eun.* 4.7.38 *ut eam [nutricem] adducam et signa ostendam haec [crepundia].*

98 *Non audiet vos Pharaon ut multa signa (מוֹפְתִים) fiant in terra Aegypti. Moyses autem et Aaron fecerunt omnia ostenta (מוֹפְתִים), quae scripta sunt, coram Pharaone.*

the plagues function as the *signa* for an extended recognition scene of God's identity and omens that predict future events.⁹⁹

Jerome expands the recognition theme by combining it with aretalogical language. Such language commonly appears in Exodus: *Et ait ego sum deus patris tui Deus Abraham Deus Isaac Deus Iacob* 'And he said, I am the God of your father, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob' (Exod 3:6). The redundant *ego* followed by a list of the dieties with various names parallels aretalogies and fits the formal context of the revelation at the burning bush.¹⁰⁰ A particularly striking variation of the aretalogy motif appears in chapter 31. *Videte ut sabbatum custodiatis quia signum est inter me et vos in generationibus ut sciatis quia ego Dominus qui sanctifico vos* 'See that you keep the sabbath as it is a sign between me and you throughout the generations so that you know that I am the Lord who sanctify you' (Exod 31:13) from a Classical point of view reads like a combination of *anagnoresis* and aretalogy.¹⁰¹ That is, the sabbath functions as a token for recognizing God's virtue. This becomes even more interesting in Exod 31:17 where the *sabbatum* is described as a *signum perpetuum*, as if the Israelites must constantly go through the process of recognition, which has Christological implications.¹⁰²

99 The locus classicus for *anagnoresis* is Aristotle, *Poet.* 1454b: εἴδη δὲ ἀναγνωρίσεως, πρώτη μὲν ἡ ἀτεχνολάγη . . . ἡ δὲ τῶν σημείων.

100 E.g., the famous Isis aretalogies discussed in Maria Totti, *Ausgewählte Texte der Isis- und Sarapis-Religion* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1985), 1–10. See also Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1929). Similarly, the first commandment, *ego sum Dominus Deus tuus qui* etc. (Exod 20:2). Even Jerome's *quis ego sum* for *כִּי אֲנִי* 'who am I?' (Exod 3:11), following *α' / θ'* τίς ἐγώ εἰμι against LXX τίς εἰμι and VL *quis ego* uses aretalogical language, albeit negatively.

101 Codex Amiatinus reads *ego sum dominus*.

102 That is, Jews will always have difficulty recognizing God and therefore require signs. This makes Jewish failure to recognize Jesus as Christ through signs typical. These are not the only examples of recognition imagery. Jerome's version of *תַּעֲבֹדוּן אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים עַל הַהָר* 'and this will be the sign that I sent you: . . .) and you will serve God on this mountain' (Exod 3:12), *immolabis Deo super montem istum*, identifies the sign more specifically than LXX *λατρεύσετε . . . τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ* and VL *servietis . . . in monte*, both in the sense of what will happen and where on the mountain it will happen. However, it is not clear to me how sacrifice can be a sign here unless we take *signum* as introducing the idea of recognition according to Greek tragedy. Similarly, in Exod 4:28, Moses discloses *signa* to Aaron which thus function in accordance with recognition scenes. Pharaoh, who does not know God (5:2), acts as a foil to the Israelites for whom the purpose of the miracles is to know God (10:2). Only after the parting of the Red Sea—*scientique Aegyptii quia ego sum Dominus* (14:4)—will the Egyptians recognize God, but too late.

6.3.4.2 Passover as Conversion?

After the Israelites finally leave Egypt (Exod 12:41), the narrative pauses to describe the Passover rite (*religio Phase*, Exod 12:43) to be celebrated annually in the future (*hanc observare debent omnes filii Israël in generationibus suis*, Exod 12:42). The chapter continues with a discussion of who is permitted to partake of the Passover offering, including the case of the resident alien. At first glance *quod si quis peregrinorum in vestram voluerit transire coloniam et facere Phase Domini* (Exod 12:48) seems to be an expanded rendering of *וְעִשָּׂה פֶּסַח לַיהוָה* ‘and if a resident alien resides with you and makes the Paschal offering to the Lord’ The addition of *voluerit* introduces the idea of volition: “if the resident alien wishes to enter the settlement and to make the Passover of the Lord.” If we compare it to LXX ἐὰν δέ τις προσέλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς προσήλυτος ποιῆσαι τὸ πασχα κυρίῳ ..., προσήλυτος, ‘proselyte’ suggests the wish to “cross over” (*voluerit transire*) while ποιῆσαι τὸ πασχα κυρίῳ corresponds to Jerome’s (*voluerit*)...*facere phase Domini* which is a free rendering of the Hebrew. For both the Greek and Latin emphasize that the resident alien *גֵר* joins the Israelite community *in order to* perform the paschal sacrifice. However, there is an alternative explanation for Jerome’s translation: *voluerit*...*facere phase Domini* could be a double rendering of *וְעִשָּׂה פֶּסַח לַיהוָה*, for he has already explained in Exod 12:11 that *פֶּסַח* (*Phase*) means *transitus*.¹⁰³ That is, not only does *וְעִשָּׂה פֶּסַח* mean ‘perform the paschal sacrifice’, it also can mean ‘make a crossing over’. Thus, the paschal sacrifice becomes a ritual symbolizing entrance into the Israelite community. We should also note that the use of *colonia* indicates that religious conversion includes a change in political status: the *peregrinus* becomes a *colonus*.¹⁰⁴

6.3.4.3 Chosenness and *Peculium*

The appearance of *peculium* in Exod 19:5 merits fuller consideration because Jerome discusses the term elsewhere in *Commentarioli* on Psalms. The rendering of *סְגִלָּה* in ‘you will be to me a valued property from all the nations’ as *eritis mihi in peculium de cunctis populis mea est enim omnis terra* is striking because *peculium*, in a Latin context, refers to money or property managed more or less as his own by a person incapable of legal ownership or as a reserve

103 *Est enim Phase (id est, transitus) Domini.*

104 This view continues in Exod 12:48–49 with division of the Israelite community into indigena and colonus. The resident alien, now circumcised as well, becomes like the native, with the law applying to both the native (indigena) and the legalized settler (colonus: *eritque sicut indigena terrae*... 49 *Eadem lex erit indigenae et colono qui peregrinatur apud vos*).

fund.¹⁰⁵ However, in general, it could simply refer to private property. To understand how he arrives at *peculium*, we must consider his comment on Ps 134:4 :

Because God chose Jacob for Himself, Israel as something essential to him. No one, outside of the learned, with the exception of Holy Scriptures, use the word περιουσίῳ, that is ‘something essential’. Moreover, the meaning is made unclear because the strangeness makes the word obscure. Moreover, Aquila and the fifth column translate similarly. Only Symmachus has ‘special’, that is ἐξάρητον: in Hebrew this is called sugulla and in Latin it could be more clearly expressed as ‘*peculium*’.¹⁰⁶

It is legitimate to apply this passage to Exod 19:5 because, when Jerome discusses the same word in his commentary on Matthew, he notes that “wherever they render περιουσίον, we find sogolla, which Symmachus translates as ἐξάρητον, that is, *praecipuum* or *egregium*, it may in certain cases (*in quodam loco*) be translated *peculiare*.”¹⁰⁷ When we take these passages together, we see that he prefers *peculium* because of its etymological relationship to *peculiare*. Initially, it may seem that the *iuxta Hebraeos* here simply follows Symmachus. However, not only does Jerome use a noun instead of an adjective, he claims that in Latin *peculium* is clearer (*significantius*). And why is *peculium* more clear? *Peculium* describes the Israelites as God’s private property as opposed to special in a vague sense. This fits the context as Exod 19:5 concludes in the language of property ownership: “because the whole earth is mine” (*mea est enim omnis terra*).

6.3.4.4 Adoption

The Vulgate’s specification that Pharaoh’s daughter “legally” adopts Moses has striking interpretive implications when read in a late antique context. LXX καὶ ἐγενήθη αὐτῇ εἰς υἱόν (Exod 2:10) follows the Hebrew: וַיְהִי-לָּהּ לְבֶן ‘and he was to her [pharaoh’s daughter] for a son’ exactly, while Jerome avoids the Hebrew

¹⁰⁵ “*peculium*,” OLD.

¹⁰⁶ *Quia Jacob elegit sibi Dominus: Israhel in substantiale sibi. Verbo περιουσίῳ, id est ‘substantiali’, exceptis sanctis scripturis, nullus foris disertorum usus est et propterea obscurus redditur sensus, quia verbum, per quod sensus intellegitur, novitas occultum facit. Denique et Aquila et quinta editio similiter transtulerunt. Solus Symmachus ‘praecipuum’, id est, ἐξάρητον, posuit: quod in hebraeo dicitur sugulla, et latino sermone significantius exprimitur ‘peculium’* (Jerome, *Comm. Ps.*).

¹⁰⁷ *Ubicumque illi [Hebraei] περιουσίον expresserant, nos invenimus sogolla quod Symmachus ἐξάρητον, id est praecipuum vel egregium, transtulit, licet in quodam loco peculiare interpretatus sit* (*Comm. Matt.* 6:11–13).

idiom with *quem illa adoptavit in locum filii* ‘whom she adopted instead of a son’. In addition to the obvious literal sense of *adoptavit*, there are four additional reasons that suggest a reference to adoption here. First, in 2:9 (MT 2:10), he renders *וַתְּבִאֵהוּ לְבַת־פַּרְעֹה* ‘and she brought him to Pharaoh’s daughter’ as *tradidit filiae Pharaonis* with *tradere* connoting legal as well as physical transference. Second, the accusative *in locum* should be understood as ‘into the place [of a son]’ rather than ‘instead of a son.’ Third, the verse continues with an etymology of Moses’ name which makes no sense in Latin. However, adopted children took on the name of their new parents, with Moses being an Egyptian cognomen, as in Thutmose. Thus, “because I brought you from the water” (*quia de aqua tuli eum*) does not refer to an event that produced a name, but rather to the fact that Pharaoh’s daughter has the right to name him. Finally, although women could not legally adopt children according to Roman law, they did so anyway.¹⁰⁸ The evidence from late antiquity parallels the case of Pharaoh’s daughter since adoption by women was associated with the imperial court. For example, Valeria, the barren wife of the emperor Galerius adopted an illegitimate child.¹⁰⁹ Constantine forbade the aristocracy from adopting children of lower class mothers¹¹⁰ so Jerome portrays Pharaoh’s daughter as boldly defying late antique imperial law.

6.3.4.5 Oddities

Occasionally, a rendition might give the late antique reader pause. For example, given the hierarchical structure of the late antique imperial court, it is unusual that the king speaks directly to midwives in Exod 1:15. Similarly, “construct” in Exod 1:21 rather than the more general “make” in the Hebrew presents God as physically constructing the homes of the midwives.¹¹¹ In the case of Exod 2:22, *quem vocavit Gersam, dicens: Advena fui in terra aliena* ‘whom he called Gersam saying: I was a stranger in a foreign land’ makes little sense in Latin as opposed to the Hebrew where the etymological relationship between Gersam

108 Antii Arjava, *Women and Law in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 88.

109 Ibid. Female adoption was associated with the imperial court as it required approval by the emperor. Since a woman could not have *patria potestas* nor incorporate children into their *familia*, female adoption created a legal conundrum that the emperor could resolve by granting special permission.

110 Ibid., 212.

111 1H [Deus] *aedificavit illis domos* for *וַיֵּשֶׁב לָהֶם בָּתֵּי־מִדְיָן* follows the Hebrew more than the Greek. LXX *ἐποίησαν ἑαυταῖς οἰκίας* has the midwives making homes for themselves.

and *advena* (גַּר ger) would be clear. The reader either would not recognize the presence of wordplay here or would have to refer to an *onomastica*.¹¹²

6.4 Conclusion

Jerome's late antique Latin world has specific impacts on his translation. The numerous Latin stylistic features in the translation reflect his grammatical education. Particular renditions may also represent reactions to the biblical exegesis of his pagan contemporaries, a late antique development as non-Jews and non-Christians began to read the Bible more closely. Finally, a discernable Latinity emerges that is accessible to the monolingual Latin reader through an innerbiblical Latin hermeneutic, technical terms and idioms, and passages that have uniquely Classical and/or late antique meanings.

It would be futile to identify an overarching pattern to these influences and confine them into the straitjacket of a systematic method. Jerome's translation technique as *recentiores*-rabbinic philology describes a regular system, not a regular performance.¹¹³ Jerome's translational moves, as profound as they are, tend to be more annalistic than analytical. Rather, the translation of the Bible should receive the requisite attention in discussions of his capabilities as a Latinist, which have long been acknowledged for his other writings. The infrequency and embeddedness of these connections to Classical traditions explain why Hagendahl's magisterial work on Classical references in Jerome's writings essentially ignores the Vulgate. This chapter has addressed this lacuna by demonstrating the influence of Jerome's late antique Classical world on his renditions.

¹¹² It would make sense to Jerome who knew Hebrew and composed an *onomastica*. In *Nom. hebr.* we read *Gersam advena ibi. Gersom eiectione eorum sive advena ibi aut advena pupillae.* In *1H advena fui in terra aliena*, Jerome follows the Hebrew; see *S. Hieronymi Opera* 1.1 (CCSL 72; Turnholt: Brepols, 1969), 75.

¹¹³ On the difference, see Sollamo, "Translation Technique," 341 (following Toury). A more literal translator may more regularly render a phrase in the same way (regularity of performance) while a freer translator may regularly draw on various equivalents (regularity of system).

Conclusion

Dennis Brown writes that the Vulgate “was a necessary preliminary to the explanation of the deeper meaning of the Bible.”¹ This study, however, examines the Vulgate not as an exegetical tool but a form of exegesis itself. Translation has often been recognized as an interpretation² more than rote copying into another language:

discussions of translation usually assume that the meaning of the original is fixed, and that the translator’s task is to reproduce it as far as possible in the target language; any argument is about the appropriate mode for so doing. But if meaning is not so fixed but constantly reconstructed, contextually, and discursively, by communities of readers, then no translation, even an interlinear ‘construing’, is ever ‘innocent’, but always an act of interpretation. . . .³

Attention to the challenges raised by the Hebrew language and the noteworthy Latin renditions in Vg Exodus advances our understanding of the Vulgate as a translation and Jerome as a translator. Similar to the approach of studies on translation technique of the Septuagint, the translation technique of 1H Exodus could be described as free translation, free in the sense that it does not slavishly follow the Hebrew, but translation in the sense that literalness is its starting point (chapter 2). The model of Septuagint studies can take us only so far. In contrast to the translators of the Septuagint, we have abundant knowledge about Jerome’s life, principles of translation, and approach to biblical commentary (chapter 1). Therefore, it is possible to define the freeness of the translation more precisely (Chapter 2). This freeness includes exegetical renditions which indicate that he applied the *recentiores*-rabbinic philology

1 Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992) 87.

2 In fact, the Latin term for translator is *interpres* while *interpretatio* can mean ‘translation’.

3 Charles Martindale, *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 86. Martindale articulates a commonplace of translation theory. Consider, for example, the paradigmatic statement of George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 18: “Any thorough reading of a text out of the past of one’s own language and literature is a manifold act of interpretation.”

articulated in *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* to his translation of the Bible. Late antique grammatical categories mediated his encounter with the Hebrew (chapter 3), he critically considered, selected or combined the Greek versions—the Septuagint, Old Latin, and the *recentiores* Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion (chapter 4), and turned to rabbinic traditions (chapter 5) all in an effort to recover the “Hebrew Truth” (*Hebraica veritas*). Analysis of these exegetical traditions and translation technique further illuminates the reception of the Vulgate in its late antique Christian context (chapter 6). The *recentiores*-rabbinic philology enables Jerome to generate a Christian message that appeals to an audience familiar with Classical and late antique Latin literature.

As part of a literary and cultural system, therefore, the Vulgate, when read closely, allows for what Clifford Geertz has called a “thick description.” For Jerome approaches the Hebrew in three different ways: directly, through the Greek, or through exegetical traditions. Especially his “refractions” of the Hebrew expose the semantic, linguistic, functional, literary, and social parameters of a late antique Christian scholar and translator.⁴ Therefore, recovering exegetical traditions encoded in the Vulgate broadly illuminates late antique culture because of their Jewish, Christian, and Classical provenance. This thick description reveals Jerome’s depth as a reader and interpreter of the Bible. Moreover, since the process of translation is so complex and culturally embedded, in the end, a close textual analysis takes us beyond linguistic and literary questions to the social and cultural milieu and invites us to read Vg Exodus in relationship to recent developments in the study of late antiquity, patristics, rabbinic literature and history of biblical interpretation.

According to David Stern, some scholars are architects who develop overarching theories and some scholars are archaeologists who delve deeply

4 The term “refractions” derives from André Lefevere, “Mother Courage’s Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature, in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), 233–49. Lefevere is interested in showing how translation studies can contribute to a literary theory based on literary systems through the term “refractions.” By accepting that refractions are an inherent part of literature, analysis of translation, situated as it is on the border between two literary systems, facilitates the understanding of how refractions really operate. Since literary systems possess regulatory bodies (patrons, ideology, economics, status, critics), codes of behaviors (genre, symbols, characters, prototypical situations), and functional parameters and linguistic parameters (formal and pragmatic sides of natural language), other constraints besides semantic and linguistic ones constrain translation (235). In the end, the literary systems approach reaffirms the concept that literature (including translation) is produced by genius fettered by ideological, literary, historical, and other constraints (248). So a translation reveals these constraints.

into limited areas.⁵ While this study represents more of the archaeological approach as it excavates the layers underneath individual Latin renditions of Hebrew Exodus, it does attempt to situate these philological artifacts within broader contexts. In particular, a close reading of Jerome's translation of the book of Exodus informs and is informed by the fields of late antiquity, and Jewish, Patristic and biblical studies. I make no claims to be exhaustive here but rather suggest some ways in which this close study of the Vulgate relates to broader areas.

7.1 Late Antiquity

Conceiving Jerome as a complex and anxious negotiator of sociocultural demands also corresponds to recent developments in the study of late antiquity.⁶ Once rejected as the bastard child of the Classical world or expendable parent of the medieval period, late antiquity has emerged in recent decades as an object of investigation worthy in its own right.⁷ The terminological shift from "low empire" to "late antiquity" marked a profound change in periodization, orientation, and attitude.⁸ This programmatic shift is commonly attributed to

5 David Stern, "Vayikra Rabbah and My Life in Midrash," *Proof* 21 (2001): 37.

6 The bibliography on late antiquity is immense. See, e.g., Peter Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity: From Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971); Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992); G. W. Bowersock, *Hellenism in Late Antiquity*, *Jerome Lectures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999); and Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

7 Peter Brown deserves much of the credit for this paradigm shift. I am struck by the corresponding shift in translation studies away from denigrating translations and translators. Late antiquity itself is marked by an explosion of translators and commentators, activities often scorned as derivative.

8 The French historian Charle Le Beau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire en commençant à Constantin le Grand*, 27 vols. (1757–1811; repr. with additions Paris: Didot, 1824–36) coined the phrase "Bas-Empire" in the eighteenth century. The term "late antiquity" was first used by German art historians in the earlier twentieth century to describe a distinctive aesthetic that developed in the Constantinian era; see Alois Riegl, *Die spätromische Kunstindustrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn* (Vienna: K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckeri, 1901, 1927) and Arnaldo Marcone, "A Long Late Antiquity? Considerations on a Controversial Periodization," *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1.1 (2008): 4–19 and Edward James, "The Rise and Function of the Concept 'Late Antiquity,'" *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1.1 (2008): 20–30. James astutely observes that the

the publication of Peter Brown's *The World of Late Antiquity* in 1971. As Edward James argues, Brown does not make this paradigm shift explicit in this "manifesto for the Late Antiquity Project" until the afterword for the 1993 reprint of the book.⁹ There Brown explains that he concentrated on cultural, religious, and social history rather than political and economic developments.¹⁰ As a result, the periodization expanded to include the beginnings of the Islamic era and the Severan period (200–800 CE), where the cultural, religious, and social continuities transcended fundamental political and economic changes. In addition, focus moved from the Western to the Eastern Empire, where the source material for this newer historical orientation is far more robust and the historical ruptures less apparent. Second Sophistic, monasticism, martyrdom, late fourth-century Christian literature, rabbinic academies, rhetoric, pilgrimage, legal traditions, and religious expressions became treated as objects of cultural production valuable in their own right or sources for cultural, religious, and social history. A new narrative emerged of permeable boundaries and innovative identity formation rather than a period of decadence and decline.¹¹ Works of translation, letters, and commentaries can be viewed as

English term "late antiquity" does not merely translate the German coinage but signals a unique, late twentieth-century approach to the period particularly popular in England and the United States (20–22).

9 James, "Rise and Function," 22.

10 Brown, *World of Late Antiquity* (1993 reprint), 209.

11 The literature on identity in late antiquity is immense. See, e.g., Stephen Mitchell and Geoffrey Greatrex, eds., *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth and The Classical Press of Wales, 2000); Nicole Belayche and Simon Claude Mimouni, eds., *Les communautés religieuses dans le monde gréco-romain: essais de définition* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003); Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, *Divinations* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); David Brakke, Michael Satlow, and Steven Weitzman, eds., *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005); Elizabeth DePalma Digeser and Robert Frakes, eds., *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity* (Toronto: Edgar Kent, 2006); Isabella Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews, and Christians in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Eduard Ircinshi and Holger M. Zellentin, eds., *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Jeremy M. Schott, *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Nicole Belayche and Simon Claude Mimouni, eds., *Entre lignes de partage et territoires de passage: les identités religieuses dans les mondes Grec et Romain: "paganismes," "judaïsmes," "christianismes"* (Paris: Peeters, 2009); Adiel Schremer, *Brothers Estranged: Heresy, Christianity, and Jewish Identity in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Yoel H. Kahn, *The Three Blessings: Boundaries, Censorship, and Identity in Jewish Liturgy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Ralph Mathisen and Danuta Shanzer,

illuminating literature in their own right, not pale reflections of a Classical past or derivatives of a magpie mind. In stark contrast to the political boundaries redrawn by Diocletian and reinforced by Constantine and Christian orthodoxy invented by Eusebius and proclaimed at Nicea, late antiquity reveals a flourishing Roman Empire. In a typical and appropriate reaction to such terminological reification, some have begun to question the way these approaches neglect real decline and fundamental change.¹² To a certain degree, these debates may reflect the lingering conflict between positivists such as Arthur Marwick and constructivists such as Hayden White. History is not *res gestae* but the

eds., *Romans, Barbarians, and the Transformation of the Roman World: Cultural Interaction and the Creation of Identity in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2011); Peter Gemeinhardt and Johan Leemans, eds., *Christian Martyrdom in Late Antiquity (300–450 AD): History and Discourse, Tradition and Religious Identity* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012); Jonathan Conant, *Staying Roman: Conquest and Identity in Africa and the Mediterranean, 439–700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Alex Mullen and James Patrick, eds., *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Éric A. Rebillard, *Christians and Their Many Identities in Late Antiquity, North Africa, 200–450 CE* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012); Philip Wood, ed., *History and Identity in the Late Antique Near East, 500–1000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Jörg Rüpke, ed., *The Individual in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Aaron P. Johnson, *Religion and Identity in Porphyry of Tyre: The Limits of Hellenism in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Arthur P. Urbano, *The Philosophical Life: Biography and the Crafting of Intellectual Identity in Late Antiquity* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2013); Margaret Williams, *Jews in a Graeco-Roman Environment* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013); Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, Isabella Sandwell, and Gillian Clark, eds., *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: A Festschrift for Gillian Clark* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); Christine C. Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and The Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014); and Claudia Rapp and H. A. Drake, eds., *The City in the Classical and Post-Classical World: Changing Contexts of Power and Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

- 12 E.g., J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, "The Uses and Abuses of the Concept of 'Decline' in Later Roman History or was Gibbon Politically Incorrect?," in *Recent Research in Late Antique Urbanism*, ed. L. Lavan, *Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement* 42 (Portsmouth, NH: Archaeological Institute of America, 2001); Peter Heather, *The Fall of the Roman Empire: a New History* (London: Macmillan, 2005); Bryan Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome and the End of Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Marcone, "A Long Late Antiquity?"; James, "Rise and Function," 27–30; and Clifford Ando, "Decline, Fall and Transformation," *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1.1 (2008): 31–60.

construction of *res gestae*.¹³ In this climate, the Christian biblicist represented by Naomi Seidman typifies the world of late antiquity. Through a discourse of translation and asceticism, Jerome negotiates an identity complicated by permeable boundaries.¹⁴ Nevertheless, he should not be limited to discursive analysis, as his corpus is a treasure trove of concrete data. As an historical figure, he marks a high point of Latin biblical translation and the interaction between rabbis and Greek and Roman Christians followed by decline until the high Middle Ages. A close reading of his translation expands our understanding of this pivotal moment in history.

7.2 Jewish Studies, Patristics, and Biblical Studies

Despite these critiques that the field of late antiquity may have strayed too far from historical rigor, one of the positive developments has been the deconstruction of boundaries separating traditional academic disciplines. The notion of late antiquity has had an enormous impact on the study of the rabbinic period and patristics, which has seen an explosion of interaction.¹⁵ In Jewish studies,

13 See, fe.g., the remarks of Marcone, "A Long Late Antiquity?," 16, who writes:

"we have witnessed a progressive weakening of any vigorous philological approach and rigorous analysis of the sources so essential to the study of ancient history. This observation applies both to literary and to archaeological sources, which are appreciated more for their symbolic function as models of social behavior than for their documentary importance. Historiographical texts in particular often are treated with suspicion, because they are perceived as an expression of the mentality of the elite that produced them independently from their veracity and their chronological proximity to the events that they narrate."

Marcone et al. acknowledge the valuable contributions of post-Brownian studies and argue for a corrective. A balanced approach would be in order.

14 Considering him as a cultural and religious figure, Seidman rightly fits Jerome in a continuum of Jewish discourses on translation.

15 See, e.g., Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001) and Dale B. Martin and Patricia Cox Miller, eds., *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies: Gender, Asceticism, and Historiography* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005). The entries in G. W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar, eds., *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999) represent a variety of disciplines. Ward-Perkins, *Fall of Rome*, 172 criticizes the work for focusing on the East more than the West and omitting crucial historical entries such as the Visigoths and praetorian prefect. I find less convincing his critique of the fascinating "research into the mental and spiritual world," on the grounds that "most people in the past, like people today, spent the majority of their lives firmly

this has resulted in new interpretations of Jewish history and culture in late antiquity. There has been renewed interest in cross-cultural interchange and rethinking of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. Seth Schwartz explains the flourishing of late antique Judaism as a product of Jewish appropriation of Christian and pagan cultures. Rather than speaking of a parting of the ways, now we can refer to Judaism and Christianity as ways that never parted.¹⁶ In the 1960s, the crucial question centered on whether anti-Jewish rhetoric reflected real or imagined Jews.¹⁷ Today, the historicity of the conflict is less of interest than the function of the conflict in discursive strategies.¹⁸ A similar development has occurred in patristics.¹⁹ This cultural turn has influenced the approach to the literature of this period in two important ways. First, there have been new developments in reading rabbinic and patristic texts as literature.²⁰ These literary strategies provide avenues for exploring the intellectual and spiritual world of late antiquity. Second, there has been a renewed

in the material world, affected less by religious change than by their standard of living" (172). Not having experienced the ideological benefits of the Enlightenment, the people of late antiquity differed from the present precisely in having an all-encompassing religious worldview. For heuristic purposes, it is useful to compartmentalize material causality, but this does not mean that ancients distinguished between religious and material change.

- 16 Adam Becker and Annette Reed, *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007). Boyarin, *Dying for God*, goes so far to suggest that Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus was sympathetic with Christians. Boyarin, *Border Lines* traces the construction of a distinction between Judaism and Christianity. Leonard Rutgers, *Making Myths: Jews in Early Christian Identity Formation* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009) has recently challenged approaches like that of Becker and Reed.
- 17 Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire romain, 135–425* (Paris: de Boccard, 1948); 2nd ed. 1964 with a postscript; trans. H. McKeating (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- 18 E.g., Andrew S. Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity*. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004), who demonstrates how imagined Jews functioned in Christian self-fashioning.
- 19 The essays in Martin and Cox, *Cultural Turn* are emblematic.
- 20 Jeffrey Rubenstein, *Talmudic Stories: Narrative Art, Composition, and Culture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); Yonah Fraenkel, *Darkhei Ha'aggada Vehamidrash* (Masada: Yad Letalmud, 1991); Charles Witke, *Numen Litterarum: The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great* (Leiden: Brill, 1971); James J. O'Donnell, ed., *Augustine: Confessions*, 3 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Gillian Clark, ed., *Augustine: Confessions I–IV*. (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics—Imperial Library; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995); and Georgia S. Nugent, *Allegory and Poetics The Structure and Imagery of Prudentius' "Psychomachia"* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985).

interest in the history of biblical interpretation. For a long time, biblical studies focused on the Bible in its historical context, while the history of biblical interpretation consisted of a mad dash to collect and list treatments of verses, motifs, and images subsequent to the canonization of the Bible. Today, tracing the interpretation of a biblical verse unlocks the social, cultural, religious, and literary world of the commentator. James Kugel has been instrumental in this project.²¹ In citing the Vulgate 7 times and other versions over 180 times, he reinscribes translation as a form of interpretation at the nexus of cultural exchange. If late antique studies focus on the spiritual and religious world of the Eastern Roman Empire, biblical interpretation offers a map to this world. Within this new landscape of translation studies and late antique scholarship such conventional descriptions of Jerome must be measured.

In addition to improving the method applied to the analysis of the Vulgate, this study complements previous scholarship. Besides demonstrating Jerome's critical method, I add to the collection of Jewish traditions preserved in his work. Furthermore, reading the Vulgate as a product of late antiquity continues the tradition of textual comparison while also attending to the grammatical interests so typical of the late antique world. Drawing on the notion of Kugel and others that biblical interpretation reflects and actualizes contemporary issues, I use Jerome's literary and cultural milieu to explicate his translation and the late antique character of the translator. At the same time, considering the version *iuxta Hebraeos* 'According to the Hebrews' as a form of late antique literature, I situate the text within a Classical literary tradition. Jerome's translation should be read both as a product and producer of late antiquity.

Thus, while this study relies on the theoretical notion that translation is a form of interpretation that informs our understanding of late antique culture, it also makes an historical argument about the character and process of Jerome's translation of the Bible. Namely, it is possible to isolate interpretive traditions preserved in Jewish, Christian, and Classical sources that he embeds in his translation. Concentrating on a single biblical book, Vg Exodus, in addition to deepening our understanding of particular renditions in a largely neglected work, allows a broader, more integrative approach. Previous studies have not focused on the book of Exodus as a whole and usually concentrate on limited aspects of Jerome's translation techniques and sources. This textual analysis goes further by offering a holistic reading of these techniques and sources. Such a reading paints Jerome as a typical late antique figure moving between cultural worlds. What makes him especially interesting is that these worlds

21 James Kugel and Rowan Greer, *Early Biblical Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986) and James Kugel, *The Bible as It Was* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997).

are Christian, Classical, and Jewish and that these cultural systems are mediated through language. Analyzing Jerome's direct encounter with the Hebrew serves as a preliminary step in a broader argument. His interpretive renditions reflect a late antique individual who blurs boundaries while trafficking in the Jewish and Christian worlds. Another of these worlds is that of pagan literature and culture. Therefore, not surprisingly, we encounter a Jerome who addresses pagan readings of the Bible and incorporates Classical Latin tropes into his version of Exodus. The Vulgate represents an example of biblical interpretation and late antique Latin literature. Unpacking the interpretation encoded in a translation reveals a world in a grain of sand.

Translators often offer excellent insights about translation. *Le Ton Beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language* by Douglas R. Hofstadter²² represents a recent, illuminating example of this phenomenon. Beginning as an attempt to explore translation by rendering a short twenty-eight-line sixteenth-century French poem "A une Damoysselle malade" by Clément Marot into English, Hofstadter produced a number of versions. This evolved into a project of collecting translations of the poem from a variety of friends, family, colleagues, and others into English and languages such as German, Spanish, and Italian. The book consists of a selection of over seventy versions of this short poem interspersed with meditations on the character, challenges, and possibility of translation. Shying away from choosing the best translation, he compares the "Ma Mignonne" challenge to

a mineralogical display featuring sparkling crystals of all sorts of dazzling colors and an unimaginable array of forms. Some of these crystalline translations will appeal more to one reader, others to another. The real point of the exhibit is simply to allow readers to revel in the diversity of this collection of deeply related gems, so beautifully illustrative of the endless inventive spark residing in the human spirit.²³

The plethora of versions that all give justice to the content and form of the poem move the discussion from the problem of translation to the personality of the translator:

A translator does to an original text something like what an impressionist painter—van Gogh, say—does to a landscape: there is an inevitable and

22 Douglas R. Hofstadter, *Le Ton Beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language* (New York: Harper Collins, 1997).

23 Ibid., 13.

cherished personal touch that makes the process totally different from photography. Translators are not like cameras. . . . They distort their input so much that they are completely unique scramblers of the message—which does not mean that their scrambling is any less interesting or less valuable than the original “scene.”²⁴

What the aggregate of renditions of the French poem ultimately indicates is that each version reflects the unique voice of its translator. Not only do translators demonstrate deep understanding about the nature of translation, a translation can embody unique understandings about the nature of a translator.

24 Ibid., 388.

Bibliography

(The use of primary sources is explained under Abbreviations at the beginning of the book.)

Aberbach, Moses and Levy Smolar. "The Golden Calf Episode in Postbiblical Literature." *HUCA* 39 (1968): 91–116.

Adkin, Neil. "Biblia Catilinaria." *Maia* 55 (2003): 93–98.

Adkin, Neil. "Biblia Pagana: Classical Echoes in the Vulgate." *Aug* 40.1 (2000): 77–87.

Adkin, Neil. "Hieronymus Ciceronianus: The Catilinarians in Jerome." *Latomus* 51.2 (1992): 408–20.

Adkin, Neil. *Jerome on Virginité: A Commentary on the Libellus de Virginitate Servanda* (Letter 22). Cambridge, UK: Francis Cairns, 2003.

Adkin, Neil. "Jerome's Vow 'Never to Reread the Classics': Some Observations," *REA*, 101 (1999): 161–67.

Adkin, Neil. "Juvenal and Jerome." *CP* 89.1 (1994): 69–72.

Adkin, Neil. "Solo tantum: A Colloquialism in Saint Jerome." *Glotta* 62 (1984): 89–90.

Adkin, Neil. "Some Features of Jerome's Compositional Technique in the *Libellus de Virginitate Servanda* (Epist. 22)." *Phil* 136 (1992): 234–55.

Adkin, Neil. "Some notes on the dream of St. Jerome." *Phil* 128 (1984): 119–26.

Adkin, Neil. "Some notes on the style of Jerome's 22nd letter." *RivFilolIstrClass* 112 (1984): 287–91.

Adkin, Neil. "Tertullian in Jerome's Consolation to Heliodorus (Ep. 60)." Pages 41–45 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.

Adkin, Neil. "Vergil's Georgics and Jerome, Epist. 125, 11, 3–4," in *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* N.F. 22 (1998): 187–98.

Aejmelaus, Anneli. "What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique." Pages 531–52 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

Alexander, P. S. "Jewish Aramaic Translations." Pages 217–53 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Poetry*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.

Ando, Clifford. "Decline, Fall and Transformation." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1.1 (2008): 31–60.

Aptowitz, Viktor. "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zur Septuaginta und Vulgata I: Die Bücher Samuelis." *ZAW* 19 (1900): 241–52.

- Arjava, Antii. *Women and Law in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn. "Content-Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique." Pages 357–76 in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Factagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27. Juli 2008*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Baer, David A. *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66*. JSOTSup 318. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Baratin, Marc. *La Naissance de la Syntaxe à Rome*. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1989.
- Bardy, Gustave. "St. Jerome and Greek Thought." Pages 83–112 in *A Monument to Saint Jerome*. Edited by F. Murphy. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952.
- Bardy, Gustave. "Saint Jérôme et ses maîtres hébreux." *RBén* 46 (1934): 145–64.
- Barr, James. "St. Jerome and the Sounds of Hebrew." *JSS* 12 (1967): 1–36.
- Barr, James. "St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew." *BJRL* 49 (1966–67): 281–302.
- Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. MSU 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Barrera, J. Trebolle. "From the 'Old Latin' through the 'Old Greek' to the 'Old Hebrew' (2 Kings 10:23–25)." *Textus* 11 (1984): 17–36.
- Bartelink, Gerhardus J. M. *Hieronymus: Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57). Ein Kommentar*. Mnemosyne Supplement 61. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. *Les devanciers d'Aquila*. VTSup 10. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. "Eusèbe, La Septante et 'les autres.'" Pages 51–65 in *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*. OBO 21. Fribourg: Academic Press, 1978.
- Baskin, Judith R. *Pharaoh's Counsellors: Job, Jethro, and Balaam in Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition*. Chico, CA: Scholar's Press, 1983.
- Baskin, Judith R. "Rabbinic-Patristic Exegetical Contacts in Late Antiquity: A Bibliographical Reappraisal" Pages 53–80 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism V: Studies in Judaism and Its Greco-Roman Context*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Becker, Adam and Annette Reed. *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Belayche, Nicole and Simon Claude Mimouni, eds. *Les communautés religieuses dans le monde gréco-romain: essais de définition*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.
- Belayche, Nicole and Simon Claude Mimouni, eds. *Entre lignes de partage et territoires de passage; les identités religieuses dans les mondes Grec et Romain: "paganismes," "judaïsmes," "christianismes."* Paris: Peeters, 2009.
- Bennett, Charles E. *New Latin Grammar*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1925.
- Berger, Samuel. *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge*. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1893.

- Bialik, Nahman Chaim. *Halachah and Aggadah*. Translated by Leon Simon. London: Education Department of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, 1944.
- Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem... cura et studio monachorum abbatiae pontificiae S. Hieronymi in urbe ordinis S. Benedicti edita* 1–16. Rome: Typis polyglottis Vaticanis, 1926–81.
- Blondheim, David S. *Les parles judéo-romaine et la Vetus Latina. Étude sur la rapport entre les traductions bibliques en langue romaine des Juifs au Moyen Age et les anciennes versions*. Paris: É. Champion, 1925.
- Böhler, Dieter. “‘Treu und schön’ oder nur ‘treu’?: Sprachästhetik in den Esrabüchern.” Pages 97–105 in vol. 3 of *Im Brennpunkt : die Septuaginta*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Dieter Böhler. BWANT. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007.
- Bonnefoy, Yves. “Translating Poetry.” Pages 186–92 in *Theories of Translation*. Edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Booth, Alan D. “The date of Jerome’s birth.” *Phoenix* 33 (1979): 346–52.
- Bowersock, Glen W. *Hellenism in Late Antiquity, Jerome Lectures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Bowersock, Glen W., Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar, eds. *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, Divinations. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, “Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot,” *BIOCS* 39 (2006): 27–46.
- Brakke, David, Michael Satlow, and Steven Weitzman, eds. *Religion and the Self in Antiquity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- Braverman, Jay. *Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1978.
- Brown, Dennis. “Jerome and the Vulgate.” Pages 355–79 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation, vol. 1: The Ancient Period*. Edited by A. J. Hauser and D. F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Brown, Dennis. *Vir Trilinguis*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992.
- Brown, Peter. “Pagan.” Page 625 in *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*. Edited by G. W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Brown, Peter. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

- Brown, Peter. *The World of Late Antiquity: From Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1971.
- Bussières, Marie-Pierre. *Ambrosiaster: Contre les païens (Question sur l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament 114) et Sur le destin (Question sur l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament 115)*. SC 512. Paris: Cerf, 2007.
- Bussières, Marie-Pierre. "Ambrosiaster's Second Thoughts About Eve." *J ECS* 23 (2015): 55–69.
- Burstein, Eitan. "La compétence de Jérôme en hébreu. Explication de certaines erreurs." *Revue des études augustinienne*s 21 (1975): 3–12.
- Burstein, Eitan. "La compétence en hébreu de saint Jérôme." PhD diss., University of Poitiers, 1971.
- Cain, Andrew. "In Ambrosiaster's Shadow: A Critical Re-Evaluation of the Last Surviving Letter Exchange between Pope Damasus and Jerome." *Revue des études augustinienne*s 51 (2005): 257–77.
- Cain, Andrew. *Jerome's Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Cain, Andrew. *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Cain, Andrew. "Rethinking Jerome's Portraits of Holy Women." Pages 47–58 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Cain, Andrew, ed. and trans. *St. Jerome: Commentary on Galatians*. The Gatherers of the Church 121. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.
- Cain, Andrew and Josef Lössl, eds. *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Cameron, Alan. "Echoes of Vergil in St. Jerome's Life of St. Hilarion." *CP* 63 (1968): 55–56.
- Cameron, Alan. "St. Jerome and Claudian." *VC* 19 (1965): 111–13.
- Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Cameron, John S. "The Rabbinic Vulgate?" Pages 117–30 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Cameron, John S. "The Vir Triculus. An Investigation of Classical, Jewish and Christian Influences on Jerome's Translation of the Psalter iuxta Hebraeos." Ph.D. diss., Oxford, 2006.
- Canellis, Aline. "L'*In Zachariam* de Jérôme et la Tradition Alexandrine." Pages 153–162 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Canellis, Aline. "Saint Jérôme et les passions: sur les quattuor perturbationes des Tusculanens." *VC* 54 (2000): 178–203.

- Cannon, W. W. "Jerome und Symmachus: Some Points in the Vulgate Translation of Koheleth." *ZAW* 45 (1927): 191–99.
- Carroll, Mitchell. *Aristotle's Poetics, C. XXV: In the Light of the Homeric Scholia*. Baltimore: J. Murphy, 1895.
- Catford, John C. "Translation Shifts." Pages 141–47 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Catullus. *Tibullus. Pervigilium Veneris*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Heinemann, 1995.
- Cavallera, Ferdinand. *St. Jérôme: sa vie et son oeuvre*. Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum; Paris: Honoré Champion, 1922.
- Chadwick, Henry. *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. Oxford History of the Christian Church. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Chamberlain, Lori. "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation." Pages 314–29 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Chesterman, Andrew. "Hypotheses about Translation Universals." Pages 1–13 in *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*. Edited by Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjaer, and Daniel Gile. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2004.
- Childs, Brevard. *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.
- Chin, Catherine M. *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Clark, Gillian, ed. *Augustine: Confessions I–IV*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics—Imperial Library. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Conant, Jonathan. *Staying Roman: Conquest and Identity in Africa and the Mediterranean, 439–700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Condamin, Albert. "Les caractères de la traduction de la Bible par s. Jérôme." *RSR* 2–3 (1911–12): 425–40; pp. 105–38.
- Condamin, Albert. "L'influence de la tradition juive dans la version de saint Jérôme." *RSR* 5 (1914): 1–21.
- Condamin, Albert. "Un procédé littéraire de s. Jérôme dans la traduction de la Bible." Pages 89–96 in *Miscellanea Geronimiana*. Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1920.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Conybeare, F. C. and St. George Stock. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Reprint. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.
- Cooper, Stephen A. and David G. Hunter. "Ambrosiaster Redactor Sui: the Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles (Excluding Romans)." *RevEtAug* 56 (2010): 69–91.

- Courcelle, Pierre. *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 159. Paris: de Boccard, 1943.
- Courcelle, Pierre. *Late Latin Writers and Their Greek Sources*. Translated by Harry E. Wedeck. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Courtray, Régis. "Jérôme, traducteur du 'Livre de Daniel.'" *Pallas* 75 (2007): 105–24.
- Courtray, Régis. "La Figure des Deux Larrons chez Jérôme." Pages 105–16 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- De Lange, Nicholas R. M. "Jewish Influence on Origen." Pages 225–42 in *Origeniana: Premier Colloque international des études origénienne*. Edited by Henri Crouzel, Gennaro Lomiento, and Josep Ruis-Campo Bari: Istituto di letteratura cristiana antica, Università di Bari, 1975.
- De Lange, Nicholas R. "Origen and Jewish Bible Exegesis." *JJS* 22 (1971): 31–52.
- De Lange, Nicholas R. *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third Century Palestine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- De Lange, Nicholas R. "Origen and the Rabbis on the Hebrew Bible." *StPatr* 14.3 (1976): 117–21.
- Deconinck, Joseph. *Essai sur la chaîne de l'Octateuque*. BEHEH 195. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1912.
- Devine, Andrew M. and Laurence D. Stephens. *Latin Word Order: Structured Meaning and Information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Devresse, Robert. *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois*. StT 201. Vatican: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1959.
- Di Santo, Emanuele. *L'apologetica dell'Ambrosiaster: Cristiani, pagani e giudei nella Roma tardoantica*. SEAug 112. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2008.
- Dietz, David. "Historia in the Commentary of Servius." *TAPA* 125 (1995): 61–97.
- Digester, Elizabeth DePalma and Robert Frakes, eds. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*. Toronto: Edgar Kent, 2006.
- Dines, Jennifer Mary. "The Septuagint of Amos: A Study in Interpretation." PhD diss., University of London, 1991.
- Doutreleau, Louis, ed. *Didyme L'Aveugle. Sur Zacharie*. 3 vols. sc 83–85; Paris: Cerf, 1962.
- Dryden, John. "On Translation." Pages 17–31 in *Theories of Translation*. Edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Duval, Yves-Marie, ed. *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*. Paris: Études augustinienes, 1988.
- Duval, Yves-Marie, ed. *Le livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine. Sources et influences du commentaire sur Jonas de s. Jérôme*. Paris: Études augustinienes, 1973.
- Elliot, C. J. "Hebrew Learning among the Fathers." *Dictionary of Christian Biography* 2:851–72 (ed. William Smith and Henry Wace, 1880).

- Elon, Menahem. "Interpretation." Pages 57–73 in *The Principles of Jewish Law*. Edited by Menahem Elon. Jerusalem: Keter, 1975.
- Epstein, Isidore, trans. and ed. *The Babylonian Talmud*. London: Soncino, 1935–48.
- Estin, Colette. *Les Psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions juives antérieures Rome*. Collectanea Biblica Latina 15. Rome: San Giralomo, 1984.
- Everson, David L. "The *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate of the Book of Exodus." Pages 370–86 in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Everson, David L. "The 'Vetus Latina' and the Vulgate of the Book of Genesis." Pages 519–36 in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Feldman, Louis. "Josephus' Portrait of Moses." *JQR* 82 (1992): 285–328; *JQR* 83 (1992–93) 7–50, 301–30.
- Feldman, Louis. *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, vol. 3 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Field, Frederick, ed. *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt*. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964.
- Filoramo, Giovanni. "Eschatology." *Encyclopaedia of the Early Church* 1:284–86.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Fontaine, Jacques and Charles Pietri. *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1985.
- Fraenkel, Yonah. *Darkhei Ha'aggada Vehamidrash*. Masada: Yad Letalmud, 1991.
- Frakes, Robert. *Compiling the Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Frakes, Robert. "The Religious Identity and Purpose of the Compiler of the Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum or Lex Dei." Pages 126–47 in *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Robert M. Frakes and DePalma Digeser. Toronto: Edgar Kent, 2006.
- Frawley, William. "Prolegomenon to a Theory of Translation." Pages 250–63 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Freedman, H. and M. Simon, eds. *Midrash Rabbah*. London: Soncino, 1961.
- Friedlander, Gerald, trans. *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezer*. London: Kegan Paul, 1916. Repr., New York: Hermon, 1965.
- Fürst, Alfons. "Aktuelle Tendenzen der Hieronymus-Forschung: Impressionen von einer Tagung über Hieronymus in Cardiff." *Adamantius* 13 (2007): 144–52.
- Fürst, Alfons. *Hieronymus: Askese und Wissenschaft in der Spätantike*. Freiburg: Herder, 2003.

- Fürst, Alfons. "Jerome Keeping Silent: Origen and his Exegesis of Isaiah." Pages 141–50 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Fürst, Alfons. "Veritas Latina. Augustins Haltung gegenüber Hieronymus' Bibelübersetzungen." *RevEtAug* 40 (1994): 105–26.
- Gager, John G. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.
- Gallagher, Edmon L. *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Gasset, Ortega Y. "The Misery and Splendor of Translation." Pages 93–112 in *Theories of Translation*. Edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Gemeinhardt, Peter and Johan Leemans, eds. *Christian Martyrdom in Late Antiquity (300–450 AD): History and Discourse, Tradition and Religious Identity*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, Emil Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
- Gildersleeve, Basil and Gonzalez Lodge. *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1895.
- Gilliam, J. F. *Roman Army Papers*. Mavors Roman Army Researches 2. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1986.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909–38.
- Glenny, W. Edward. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. VTSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Goldin, Judah. *The Song of the Sea*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Gordon, Cyrus. "Rabbinic Exegesis in the Vulgate of Proverbs." *JBL* 49 (1930): 384–416.
- Graetz, H. "Haggadische Elemente bei den Kirchenvätern." *MGWJ* 3 (1854): 311–19, 352–55, 381–87, 428–31; 4 (1855): 187–92.
- Graves, Michael. *Jerome's Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on his Commentary on Jeremiah*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Gray, Christa. *Jerome, Vita Malchi: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Greenspoon, Leonard. "Hebrew Into Greek: Interpretation In, By, and Of the Septuagint." Pages 86–99 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation, Vol. 1: The Ancient Period*. Edited by A. J. Hauser and D. F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Gribomont, Jean. "The Translations. Jerome and Rufinus." Pages 212–46 in vol. 4 of *Patrology*. Edited by A. Di Berardino. Translated by P. Solari. Utrecht: Spectrum & Newman, 1978.
- Gruen, Erich. *Heritage and Hellenism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Grützmacher, Georg. *Hieronymus: Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1901–8.

- Gryson, Roger. Introduction to *Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe*, edited by R. Gryson and P.-A. Deproost. Freiburg: Herder, 1993.
- Gutt, Ernst-August. "Translation As Interlingual Interpretive Use." Pages 376–96 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Hacham, Noah. "The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story?" *JSJ* 36.1 (2005): 1–20.
- Hackett, Jo Ann. *A Basic Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.
- Hagendahl, Harald. *Latin Fathers and the Classics*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958.
- Hagendahl, H. and J. H. Waszink. "Hieronymus." *RAC* 15:117–39.
- Hamblenne, P. "La Longéevité de Jérôme: Prosper avait-il raison?" *Latomus* 28 (1969): 1081–1119.
- Hanson, R. P. C. *Allegory and Event*. London: SCM, 1959.
- Harrison, Carol, Caroline Humfress, Isabella Sandwell, and Gillian Clark, eds. *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: A Festschrift for Gillian Clark*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Hartmann, Louis N. "Jerome as an Exegete." Pages 35–81 in *A Monument to Saint Jerome*. Edited by Francis Murphy. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952.
- Hartog, François. *The Mirror of Herodotus: An Essay on the Representation of "the Other."* Translated by Janet Lloyd. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Hauser, A. J. and D. F. Watson, *A History of Biblical Interpretation, vol. 1: The Ancient Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Hayward, C. T. R. *Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Hayward, C. "Jewish traditions in Jerome's commentary on Jeremiah and the Targum of Jeremiah." *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 9 (1985): 100–120.
- Hayward, C. "Phinehas-the Same is Elijah: The Origins of a Rabbinic Tradition." *JJS* 29.1 (1978): 22–34.
- Hayward, C. "Saint Jerome and the Aramaic Targumim." *JSS* 32 (1987): 105–23.
- Hayward, C. "Some Observations on St. Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis and the Rabbinic Tradition." *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 13 (1990): 58–76.
- Heather, Peter. *The Fall of the Roman Empire: a New History*. London: Macmillan, 2005.
- Heinemann, Isaac. *The Methods of Aggadah*. 3rd ed. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1970 (Hebrew).
- Hirshman, Marc. *A Comparison of Rabbinics and Patristics*. Israel: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1992 (Hebrew).
- Hofstadter, Douglas R. *Le Ton Beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language*. New York: Harper Collins, 1997.
- Holtz, Louis. *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IV^e–IX^e siècle et édition critique)*. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1981.
- Honigman, Sylvie. *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas*. London: Routledge, 2003.

- Hulley, K. "Principles of Textual Criticism known to St Jerome." *HSCP* 54 (1943): 87–109.
- Hunter, David. "2008 NAPS Presidential Address: The Significance of Ambrosiaster." *J ECS* 17 (2009): 1–26.
- Huskinson, Janet. "Women and Learning: Gender and Identity in Scenes of Intellectual Life on Late Roman Sarcophagi." Pages 190–213 in *Constructing Identity in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Richard Miles. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Ircinshi, Eduard and Holger M. Zellentin, eds. *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Jacobs, Andrew S. "'Papinian Commands One Thing, Our Paul Another': Roman Christians and Jewish Law in the *Collatio Mosaicarum et Romanarum*." Pages 85–99 in *Religion and Law in Classical and Christian Rome*. Edited by Clifford Ando and Jörg Rüpke. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2006.
- Jacobs, Andrew S. *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- James, Edward. "The Rise and Function of the Concept 'Late Antiquity.'" *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1.1 (2008): 20–30.
- Jay, Pierre. "Jérôme auditeur d'Apollinaire de Laodicée à Antioche." *REAug* 20 (1974): 36–41.
- Jay, Pierre. "Jérôme et le triple sens de l'Écriture." *REAug* 26 (1980): 214–27.
- Jay, Pierre. "La datation des premières traductions de l'Ancien Testament sur l'hébreu par saint Jérôme." *REAug* 26 (1982): 208–12.
- Jay, Pierre. "Le vocabulaire exégétique de S. Jérôme dans le commentaire sur Zacharie." *REAug* 14 (1968): 3–16.
- Jay, Pierre. *L'exégèse de saint Jérôme d'après son 'Commentaire sur Isaïe'*. Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1985.
- Jay, Pierre. "Sur la date de Naissance de Saint Jérôme." *RevÉLat* 51 (1973): 262–80.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Jellicoe, Sidney, ed. *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations*. New York: Ktav, 1974.
- Johannessohn, M. "Hieronymus und die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen des Alten Testaments." *TLZ* 73 (1948): 145–52.
- Johannessohn, M. "Zur Entstehung der Ausdrucksweise der lateinischen Vulgata aus den jüngeren griechischen alt-testamentlichen Übersetzungen." *ZNW* 44 (1952–53): 90–102.
- Johnson, Aaron P. *Religion and Identity in Porphyry of Tyre: The Limits of Hellenism in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Jones, A. H. M. *The Later Roman Empire: 284–602*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.
- Kahn, Yoel H. *The Three Blessings: Boundaries, Censorship, and Identity in Jewish Liturgy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

- Kamesar, A. "The Evaluation of the Narrative Aggada in Greek and Latin Patristic Literature." *JTS* 45 (1994): 37–71.
- Kamesar, A. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesis*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Kamesar, A. Review of *Commentaires de Jérôme*, by Roger Gryson. *JTS* 45 (1994): 730–31.
- Kamin, Sarah. "The Theological Significance of the Hebraica Veritas in Jerome's Thought." Pages 242–253 in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Kaster, Robert. *Guardians of Language: the Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, Benjamin. "Jewish Traditions in the Writings of Jerome." Pages 420–30 in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context*. Edited by D. R. G. Beattie and Martin MacNamara. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, Benjamin. "The Latin Translations." Pages 299–338 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling. CRINT 2.1. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, Benjamin. "The Vulgate as a Translation." PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1968.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. London: Duckworth, 1975.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. "Latin Version, the Old." *DB* 3:47–62.
- Kooij, Arie van der. *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*. VTSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Kramer, Bärbel and Johannes Kramer. "Les éléments linguistiques hébreux chez Didyme l'Aveugle." Pages 313–23 in *Ἀλεξανδρινὰ—Hellenisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie: Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondésert*. Paris: Cerf, 1987.
- Kraus, Matthew. "Christian, Jews and Pagans in Dialogue: Saint Jerome on Ecclesiastes 12:1–7." *HUCA* 70–71 (1999–2000): 183–231.
- Kraus, Matthew. "Hebraisms in the Old Latin version of the Bible." *VT* 53 (2003): 487–513.
- Kraus, Matthew. "Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus Iuxta Hebraeos in Relation to Classical, Christian, and Jewish Traditions of Interpretation." PhD diss., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1996.
- Kraus, Matthew. "Jerome, the Book of Exodus, and the World of Late Antiquity." Pages 17–37 in *Midrash in Context: Proceedings of the 2004 and 2005 SBL Consultation on Midrash*. Edited by Lieve Teugels and Rivka Ulmer. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2007.
- Kraus, Matthew. "Vulgate. Pentateuch." In *Textual History of the Bible Online*. Edited by Arnim Lange. Leiden: Brill, 2016. <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/textual-history-of-the-bible>.

- Krauss, Samuel. "Church Fathers." *Jewish Encyclopedia* (1903) 4:80–86.
- Krauss, Samuel. "Jerome." *Jewish Encyclopedia* (1903) 7:155–118.
- Krauss, Samuel. "The Jew in the Works of the Church Father." *JQR* 5–6 (1893–94): 122–57; 82–99, 225–61.
- Kugel, James. *The Bible as It Was*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Kugel, James and Rowan Greer. *Early Biblical Interpretations*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Lamirande, Émilien. "Étude bibliographique sur les Pères de l'Église et l'Aggadah." *VC* 21 (1967): 1–11.
- Lammert, F. *De Hieronymo Donati discipulo*. Leipzig: Teubner 1912.
- Leclerc, Pierre, Edgardo M. Morales, and Adalbert de Vogüé, eds. *Jérôme: Trois vies de Moines (Paul, Malchus, Hilarion)*. sc 508. Paris: Cerf, 2007.
- Lefevere, André. "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature." Pages 233–49 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Lesky, Albin. *A History of Greek Literature*. New York: Crowell, 1966.
- Levý, Jiří. "Translation as a Decision Process." Pages 148–59 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Lewis, Philip. "The Measure of Translation Effects." Pages 31–62 in *Difference in Translation*. Edited by Joseph F. Graham. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. "The Uses and Abuses of the Concept of 'Decline' in Later Roman History or was Gibbon Politically Incorrect?" Pages 233–45 in *Recent Research in Late Antique Urbanism*. Edited by L. Lavan. Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement 42. Portsmouth, NH: Archaeological Institute of America, 2001.
- Lietzmann, H. "Hieronymus." *PW* 8.2: 1565–81.
- Loewe, Ralph. "The Jewish Midrashim and Patristic and Scholastic Exegesis of the Bible." *StPatr* 1 (1957): 492–514.
- Lübeck, Emil. *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1872.
- Lunn-Rockliffe, Sophie. *Ambrosiaster's Political Theology*. OECs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Marcone, Arnaldo. "Ciceronianus es, non Christianus." *Athenaeum* 71.1 (1993): 290–95.
- Marcone, Arnaldo. "A Long Late Antiquity? Considerations on a Controversial Periodization." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1.1 (2008): 4–19.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández. *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández and Angel Saenz-Badillos. *Theodoretus Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum: Editio Critica*. Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, 1979.
- Marouzeau, Jules. *L'ordre des Mots en Latin*. Paris: Société D'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1953.

- Marti, Heinrich. *Übersetzer der Augustin-Zeit*. *Studia et testimonia antiqua* 14. Munich: Fink, 1974.
- Martin, Dale B. Introduction to *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies: Gender, Asceticism, and Historiography*. Edited by Dale B. Martin and Patricia Cox Miller. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Martin, Dale B. and Miller, Patricia Cox, eds. *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies: Gender, Asceticism, and Historiography*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Martin, James D., ed. and rev. *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar*. 27th edition. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Martindale, Charles. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Mathisen, Ralph and Danuta Shanzer, eds. *Romans, Barbarians, and the Transformation of the Roman World: Cultural Interaction and the Creation of Identity in Late Antiquity*. Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2011.
- McCarthy, David Paul. "Saint Jerome's Translation of the Psalms: The Question of Rabbinic Tradition." Pages 155–91 in *Open thou mine eyes . . . : Essays on Aggadah and Judaica Presented to Rabbi William G. Braude on His Eightieth Birthday and Dedicated to His Memory*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1992.
- McCarthy, David Paul. "Some Useful Things Worth Knowing about the Vulgate and Jerome." *SBLSP* (1994): 321–25.
- McDermott, W. C. "S. Jerome and Greek literature." *VC* 36 (1982): 372–82.
- McLay, R. Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- McNamara, Martin. "Interpretation of Scripture in the Targumim." Pages 167–97 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation, Vol. 1: The Ancient Period*. Edited by A. J. Hauser and D. F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Meershoek, G. Q. A. *Le latin biblique d'après saint Jérôme*. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1966.
- Miles, Richard, ed. *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Mitchell, Stephen and Geoffrey Greatrex, eds. *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity*. London: Duckworth and The Classical Press of Wales, 2000.
- Mohrmann, C. "Mulier. A propos de 11 Reg 1,26." *VC* 2 (1948): 117–19.
- Moretti, Paola Francesca. "Jerome's Epistolary Portraits of Holy Women." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 7.2 (2014): 280–97.
- Mullen, Alex and James Patrick, eds. *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Murphy, Francis X., ed. *A Monument to St Jerome. Essays on some Aspects of his Life, Works and Influence*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952.

- Nabokov, Vladimir. "Problems of Translation: Onegin in English." Pages 127–143 in *Theories of Translation*. Edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Nautin, Pierre. "Hieronymus." *TRE* 15.1–2: 304–15.
- Nautin, Pierre. "La liste des oeuvres de Jérôme dans le *De viris inlustribus*." *Orpheus* 5 (1984): 319–34.
- Nautin, Pierre. "L'activité littéraire de Jérôme de 387 à 392." *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 115 (1983): 247–59.
- Nautin, Pierre. "Le premier échange épistolaire entre Jérôme et Damase, lettres réelles ou fictives?" *FZPhTh* 30 (1983): 331–44.
- Nautin, Pierre. *Origène. Sa vie et son œuvre*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.
- Neuschäfer, Bernard. *Origenes als Philologe*. Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 18.1–2. Basel: Reinhardt, 1987.
- Newman, Hillel. "How Should We Measure Jerome's Hebrew Competence?" Pages 131–40 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Newman, Hillel. "Jerome and the Jews." Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1997 (Hebrew).
- Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence." Pages 126–40 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929.
- Nugent, Georgia S. *Allegory and Poetics: The Structure and Imagery of Prudentius' "Psychomachia"*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985.
- Oden, Thomas C., ed. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament. Vol. 3, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001.
- O'Donnell, James J., ed. *Augustine: Confessions*. 3 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Olofsson, Staffan. *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. ConBOT 30. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.
- Olofsson, Staffan. *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version*. ConBOT 57. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Opelt, Ilona. *Hieronymus' Streitschriften*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1973.
- Opelt, Ilona. "Lukrez bei Hieronymus." *Hermes* 100 (1972): 76–81.
- Opelt, Ilona. "San Girolamo e i suoi maestri ebrei." *Aug* 28 (1988): 327–38.
- Orlinsky, Harry. "The Columnar Order of the Hexapla." Pages 369–81 in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations*. Edited by Sidney Jellicoe. Library of Biblical Studies. New York: Ktav, 1974.
- Oswald, Renate. "Aussetzungsmythen und -sagen." *DNP* 2:336–38.
- Palmer, James Karol. "'Not Made With Tracing Paper': Studies in the Septuagint of Zechariah." PhD diss., Cambridge University, 2004.

- Pardes, Ilana. "Imagining the Birth of Ancient Israel: National Metaphors in the Bible." Pages 9–41 in *Cultures of the Jews*. Edited by David Biale. New York: Schocken, 2002.
- Park, Aaron W. *The Book of Amos as Composed and Read in Antiquity*. StBibLit37. New York: Lang, 2001.
- Patte, Daniel. *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*. SBLDS 22. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Paz, Octavio. "Translation: Literature and Letters." Pages 159–61 in *Theories of Translation*. Edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Pease, A. S. "The Attitude of Jerome towards Pagan Literature." *TAPA* 50 (1919): 140–67.
- Pelletier, Andre. "Josephus, the Letter of Aristee, and the Septuagint." Pages 97–115 in *Josephus, the Bible and History*. Edited by Louis Feldman and Gohei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.
- Pelletier, Andre. *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, index complet des mots grecs*. Paris: Cerf, 1962.
- Penna, Angelo. *Principi e crattere dell'esegesi di San Gerolamo*. Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici 102. Rome: Pontificio istituto biblico, 1950.
- Penna, Angelo. *S. Gerolamo*. Turin: Marietti, 1949.
- Petit, Françoise, ed. *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum I. Catena Sinaitica*. CCSG 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1977.
- Petit, Françoise, ed. *La Chaîne sur L'Exode: I. Fragments de Sévère D'Antioche*. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Petuchowski, J. J. "Halakhah in the Church Fathers." Pages 257–74 in *Essays in Honor of Solomon B. Freehof*. Pittsburgh, PA: Rodef Shalom Congregation, 1964.
- Philo. *On Abraham. On Joseph. On Moses*. Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Pietersma, Albert. "LXX and DTS: A New Archimedian Point for Septuagint Studies?" *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 1–11.
- Plater, William E. and H. J. White. *A Grammar of the Vulgate*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926.
- Porter, S. E. "Septuagint/Greek Old Testament." *DNTB* 1099–1106.
- Propp, William. *Exodus 1–18*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Propp, William. *Exodus 19–40*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 2006.
- Quentin, Henri. *Mémoire sur l'établissement du texte de la Vulgate*. Collectanea Biblica Latina 6. Rome: Desclée, 1922.
- Rahmer, Moritz. *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus*. Breslau: Schletter, 1861.
- Rahmer, Moritz. *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus: Die Commentarien zu den 12 kleinen Propheten*. 2 vols. Berlin: Schletter, 1902.

- Rahmer, Moritz. "Haggadische Analekton aus den pseudo-hieronymianische Quaestiones." Pages 314–24 in *Jubelschrift zum Siebzigsten Geburtstage des Prof. Dr. H. Graetz*. Breslau: Schottlaender, 1887.
- Rapp, Claudia and H. A. Drake, eds. *The City in the Classical and Post-Classical World: Changing Contexts of Power and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Raspanti, Giacomina. "The Significance of Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians* in his Exegetical Production." Pages 163–74 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Rebenich, Stefan. *Hieronymus und Sein Kreis: Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1992.
- Rebenich, Stefan. "Inventing an Ascetic Hero: Jerome's 'Life of Paul the First Hermit.'" Pages 13–28 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Rebenich, Stefan. *Jerome*. ECF. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Rebenich, Stefan. "Jerome: The 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas' VC 47 (1993): 50–77.
- Rebillard, Éric A. *Christians and Their Many Identities in Late Antiquity, North Africa, 200–450 CE*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Rehm, M. "Die Bedeutung hebräischer Woerter bei Hieronymus." *Bib* (1954): 174–97.
- Reiss, Katharina. "Type, Kind and Individuality of Text: Decision Making in Translation." Pages 160–71 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Reuschenbach, Felix. "Hieronymus als Übersetzer der Genesis." PhD diss., Freiburg, 1942.
- Rice, Eugene F., Jr. *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Riegl, Alois. *Die spätromische Kunstindustrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn*. Vienna: K.K. Hof- und Staatsdrückerei, 1901, 1927.
- Rinaldi, Giancarlo. *Biblia Gentium: primo contributo per un indice delle citazioni, dei riferimenti e della allusioni alla bibbia negli autori pagani, greci e latini, di età imperiale*. Rome: Libreria sacre scritture, 1989.
- Roberts, Bleddyn J. *The Old Testament Texts and Versions*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951.
- Robertson, R. G., trans. "Ezekiel the Tragedian: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 803–819 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol 1: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Rosetti, Dante Gabriel. "Preface to The Early Italian Poets." Pages 64–67 in *Theories of Translation*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

- Rousseau, Philip. "Jerome on Jeremiah: Exegesis and Recovery." Pages 73–86 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Rousseau, Philip. "Pagan, Paganism." Page 1091 in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Rubenstein, Jeffrey. *Talmudic Stories: Narrative Art, Composition, and Culture*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Rubio, Gonzalo. "Semitic influence in the history of Latin syntax." Pages 195–239 in *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*. Edited by P. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Rüpke, Jörg, ed. *The Individual in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Rutgers, Leonard. *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Rutgers, Leonard. *Making Myths: Jews in Early Christian Identity Formation*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Sabatier, Pierre. *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae seu Vetus Italica, Rheims, 1739–1743*. Rheims: Reginaldum Florentain, 1751.
- Salvesen, Alison. "A Convergence of the Ways? The Judaizing of Christian Scripture by Origen and Jerome." Pages 233–58 in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Salvesen, Alison. *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*. JSS Monographs 15. Manchester: University of Manchester, 1991.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13.
- Sandwell, Isabella. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews, and Christians in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Schaff, Philip and Henry Wace, eds. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series*, Vol. 6. Translated by William H. Fremantle, G. Lewis, and W. G. Martley. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1893.
- Schäublin, Christoph. *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*. Theophaneia 23. Bonn: Hanstein, 1974.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "From On the Different Methods of Translating." Pages 36–54 in *Theories of Translation*. Edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Schniedewind, William M. "Innerbiblical Exegesis." Pages 502–509 in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books*. Edited by Bill T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005.

- Schogt, Henry. "Semantic Theory and Translation Theory." Pages 193–203 in *Theories of Translation*. Edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Schott, Jeremy M. *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Schremer, Adiel. *Brothers Estranged Heresy, Christianity, and Jewish Identity in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Schulz-Flügel, Eva. "The Latin Old Testament Tradition." Pages 642–62 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. I From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by Magne Saebø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Edited by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973.
- Schwartz, Seth. *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Schwarz, Werner. *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- Scourfield, J. H. D. *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Scourfield, J. "Jerome, Antioch, and the Desert: A Note on Chronology." *JTS* 37 (1986): 117–21.
- Segal, Peretz. "Jewish Law During the Tannaitic Period." Pages 106–14 in *An Introduction to the History and Sources of Jewish Law*. Edited by N. S. Hecht, et al. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Seidman, Naomi. *Faithful Renderings: Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Shanzer, Danuta. "Jerome, Tobit, Alms, and the Vita Aeterna." Pages 87–104 in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Shepardson, Christine C. *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and The Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.
- Shutt, R. J. H. "Letter of Aristeas: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 7–34 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Siegfried, Carl. "Midraschisches zu Hieronymus und Pseudo-Hieronymus." *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 9 (1883): 346–52.
- Simon, Marcel. "Melchisédech dans la polémique entre juifs et chrétiens et dans la légende." *RHPR* 17 (1937): 58–93.

- Simon, Marcel. *Verus Israel: Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire romain, 135–425*. Paris: de Boccard, 1948. Translated by H. McKeating. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Siquans, Agnethe. *Der Deuteronomiumkommentar des Theodoret von Kyros*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2002.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Skehan, Patrick W. "St. Jerome and the Canon of the Holy Scriptures." Pages 257–87 in *A Monument to Saint Jerome*. Edited by F. Murphy. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952.
- Skemp, Vincent T. M. *The Vulgate of Tobit Compared With Other Ancient Witnesses*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1952.
- Smelik, Willem. *Rabbis, Language, and Translation in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Sollamo, Raija, "Translation Technique and Translation Studies: The Problem of Translation Universals." Pages 339–51 in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Sparks, H. F. D. "Jerome as Biblical Scholar." *CHB* 1 (1970): 510–41.
- Sperber, Daniel. "Tax Gatherers." *EncJud* 20:558–59.
- Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Steiner, George. "The Hermeneutic Motion." Pages 186–91 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Steinhausen, J. "Hieronymus und Laktanz in Trier." *TZ* 20 (1951): 126–54.
- Stern, David. "Vayikra Rabbah and My Life in Midrash." *Prooftexts* 21 (2001): 23–38.
- Stern, Menahem. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Science, 1974.
- Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Stummer, Friedrich. "Beiträge zu dem Problem: Hieronymus und die Targumim." *Bib* 18 (1937): 174–81.
- Stummer, Friedrich. "Beiträge zur Exegese der Vulgata." *ZAW* 62 (1950): 152–67.
- Stummer, Friedrich. "Die lateinische Bibel vor Hieronymus und das Judentum." *Theologie und Glaube* 19 (1927): 184–99.
- Stummer, Friedrich. *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1928.
- Stummer, Friedrich. "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testament aus der hebraica veritas." *Bib* 10 (1929): 3–30.

- Stummer, Friedrich. "Griechisch-römische Bildung und christliche Theologie in der Vulgata des Hieronymus." *ZAW* 58 (1940–1941): 251–69.
- Stummer, Friedrich. "Spuren jüdischer und christlicher Einflüsse auf die Übersetzung der Grossen Propheten durch Hieronymus." *JAOS* 8 (1928): 35–48.
- Sutcliffe, E. F. "Jerome." *CHB* 2 (1969): 80–101.
- Sutcliffe, E. "The Name Vulgate." *Bib* 29 (1948): 345–352.
- Sutcliffe, E. "St. Jerome's Hebrew Manuscripts." *Bib* 29 (1948): 195–204.
- Sutcliffe, E. "St. Jerome's Pronunciation of Hebrew." *Bib* 29 (1948): 112–25.
- Swete, Henry B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- Szondi, Peter. "The Poetry of Constancy: Paul Celan's Translation of Shakespeare's Sonnet 105." Pages 163–85 in *Theories of Translation*. Edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Thierry, J. J. "The date of the dream of Jerome." *VC* 17 (1963): 28–40.
- Tkacz, Catherine Brown. "Labor tam utilis: The Creation of the Vulgate." *VC* 50 (1996): 42–72.
- Tkacz, Catherine Brown. "Ovid, Jerome, and the Vulgate." *StPatr* 33 (1997): 378–82.
- Totti, Maria. *Ausgewählte Texte der Isis-und Sarapis-Religion*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1985.
- Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Benjamins Translation Library 4. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.
- Toury, Gideon. "A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?" *BIOSSCS* 39 (2006): 13–25.
- Toury, Gideon. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation." Pages 198–212 in *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Tov, Emmanuel. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Tov, Emmanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd rev. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Troxel, Ronald L. *LXX Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement 124. Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint." Pages 67–82 in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea*. Edited by N. Fernández Marcos. Madrid: Istituo Arias Montano, 1985.
- Urbach, Ephraim. "The Repentance of the People of Nineveh and the Discussion between Jews and Christians." *Tarbiz* 20 (1948–1949): 118–22.
- Urbano, Arthur P. *The Philosophical Life : Biography and the Crafting of Intellectual Identity in Late Antiquity*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2013.

- Valéry, Paul. "Variations on the Eclogues." Pages 113–26 in *Theories of Translation*. Edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Van der Louw, Theo A. W. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. CBET 47. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Veltri, Guiseppe. *Libraries, Translations, and 'Canonic' Texts: The Septuagint, Aquila, and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement 109. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Venuti, Lawrence, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Venuti, Lawrence, ed. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen bibel nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der erzabtei Beuron*. Freiburg: Herder 1949–.
- Vogels, Heinrich. "Ambrosiaster und Hieronymus." *Revue Bénédictine* 66 (1956): 14–19.
- Volgers, Annelie and Claudio Zamagni, eds. *Erotapokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-answer Literature in Context*. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wan, Sze-Kar. "Philo's *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesim*: A Synoptic Approach." *SBLSP* 32 (1993): 22–53.
- Ward-Perkins, Bryan. *The Fall of Rome and the End of Civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Wasserstein, Abraham. *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*. Edited by David Wasserstein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Weber, Robert, et al., ed. *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem 1–2*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.
- Weigert, Sebastian *Übersetzungsprinzipien und Quellen der Deuteronomiumübersetzung des Hieronymus*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2016.
- Weingarten, Susan. *The Saint's Saints: Hagiography and Geography in Jerome*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Wevers, John William. *Text History of the Greek Exodus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- White, H. "Vulgate." *DB* 5: 873–90.
- Wiesen David S. *St. Jerome as a Satirist. A Study in Christian Latin Thought and Letters*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1964.
- Wilken, Robert L. *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Williams, Margaret. *Jews in a Graeco-Roman Environment*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

- Williams, Megan Hale. "Lessons from Jerome's Jewish Teachers: Exegesis and Cultural Interaction in Late Antique Palestine." Pages 66–86 in *Jewish Biblical Interpretation and Cultural Exchange: Comparative Exegesis in Context*. Edited by Natalie B. Dohrmann and David Stern. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Williams, Megan Hale. *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Witke, Charles. *Numen Litterarum: The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Wood, Philip, ed. *History and Identity in the Late Antique Near East, 500–1000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- The Works of the Emperor Julian*. Translated by Wilmer Cave Wright. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Wutz, Franz X. *Onomastica sacra: Untersuchungen zum Liber interpretationis nominum Hebraicorum des hl. Hieronymus*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 41.1–2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914–15.
- Zamudio, Rafael Jiménez. "Algunos aspectos fonéticos y morfológicos de las versiones latinas del Libro de Rut." *Cuadernos de filología clásica. Estudios latinos* 2.26 (2006): 103–19.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen als Vorlage der Vulgata in den prophetischen Schriften*. Braunsberg: Staatlichen Akademie, 1943–44.
- Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Sapientia Salomonis. Septuaginta 12.1*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Index of Modern Authors

Adkin, N. 17n, 27n, 39, 40, 180n, 181n
Aejmelaus, A. 2, 3, 4
Ausloos, H. 4

Bardy, G. 23, 23n, 28, 28n
Barr, J. 2, 3, 4
Barthélemy, D. 28
Benjamin, W. 59
Bonnefoy, Y. 58n
Booth, A. D. 16n
Boyarín, D. 178, 219n
Braverman, J. 21, 22
Brown, D. 24n, 36n, 47n, 54n, 137n, 213
Brown, P. 215n, 216

Cain, A. 26, 27, 32, 181n
Cameron, J. 28, 29, 29n, 30, 31n, 37n, 41
Canellis, A. 31, 32
Cannon, W. W. 114n
Catford, J. C. 59n
Chamberlain, L. 34n

Doutreleau, L. 32
Dryden, J. 58n

Elliot, C. J. 24n
Estin, C. 31n

Frawley, W. 62n
Fürst, A. 27

Gasset, O. Y. 56n
Geertz, C. 214
Glenny, W. E. 4, 5, 5n, 6, 6n, 7, 7n, 8
Graves, M. 26n, 62, 62n, 63n, 67, 86, 88, 89
Grützmacher, G. 33, 33n, 34, 34n, 35, 35n
Gryson, R. 24n

Hagendahl, H. 17n, 116n, 180, 181n, 212
Hamblenne, P. 16n
Hayward, C. T. R. 30n
Hofstadter, D. R. 221
Holz, L. 183

Irvine, M. 63

James, E. 215n, 216
Jay, P. 16n, 46

Kamesar, A. 1, 20, 21, 24, 26n, 29, 30, 108n,
113n, 114–115, 115n
Kamin, S. 137
Kedar-Kopfstein, B. 38, 38n, 39n, 42, 47, 55,
55n, 56, 57, 57n, 58, 61, 62n
Kelly, J. N. D. 16n
Kugel, J. 36n, 140, 171, 220

Le Beau, C. 215n
Lefevre, A. 214n
Lemmelijn, B. 4
Levý, J. 57n, 128
Lössl, J. 27, 32
Lotman, Y. 59n
Ludskanov, A. 59n

Marcone, A. 218n
Marot, C. 221
Martindale, C. 213n
Marwick, A. 217
McCarthy, D. P. 25, 36n
Mclay, T. 5
Mohrmann, C. 116n

Nautin, P. 23, 24n, 28n
Newman, H. 24n, 26, 31n, 137

Olofsson, S. 12

Pardes, I. 144
Paz, O. 58n
Propp, W. 124n

Rebenich, S. 16n, 17n, 18n, 24n, 27n
Reuschenbach, F. 37, 37n, 53n
Rousseau, P. 27, 27n

Salvesen, A. 29n, 114, 115–116, 116n, 125n, 138n
Schäfer, P. 33n
Schogt, H. 58n, 59n
Schulz-Flügel, E. 35n
Schwarz, W. 109n, 113n

- Schwartz, S. 219
Seidman, N. 218, 218n
Shanzer, D. 28, 28n
Soisalon-Soininen, I. 2, 3, 4
Sollamo, R. 2, 3, 4, 10
Steiner, G. 32n, 213n
Stern, D. 214
Szondi, P. 59n
- Tkacz, C. B. 137, 137n
Toury, G. 8, 9
Tov, E. 2, 3, 4, 6
- Van der Louw, T. A. W. 11
Vermes, G. 22
- Ward-Perkins, B. 218n
Weigert, S. 37n, 61
Wevers, J. W. 6
White, H. 217
Williams, M. 26, 26n, 27, 27n, 31n, 32, 33n

Index of Ancient Sources

1. Hebrew Bible

Genesis	30
1:5	50
1:8	51
1:10	51
1:14	50
1:21	54
1:26–27	51
1:27	52
6:2	54
6:4	51
6:5	52
6:6	54
6:7	50
6:14	51
7:21	163n
9:6	52
9:13	54
9:18	54
9:22	51
12:17	52
14:19	75n
14:22	75n
15:14	124n
16:14	50
17:6	50
18:11	53
18:25	53
19:20	53
22:16	51
23:15	37
25:29	52
27:4	52
29:2	54
30:32	52
31:2	50, 51
31:47	51
37:19	51
37:34	53
41:11	54
41:37	51
42:13	51
42:21	51

Exodus

23, 32	
1:1	71–73, 72n, 79–80, 103
1:7	52, 161–163, 162n
1:9	67, 118
1:10	119, 147–150
1:10–11	95
1:11	71n, 119
1:12	53, 148–150
1:13	127
1:14	51, 82–83, 103
1:15	95, 211
1:15–16	97–98
1:16	76–77
1:17	70–71, 80–81, 95, 98, 103
1:18	98
1:19	54, 163–165
1:20	95
1:21	211
1:22	120
2:2	53, 98n
2:3	53, 71n, 95, 143–145
2:5	52, 91, 104
2:9	211
2:10	98n, 210
2:12	53
2:13	122
2:15	120
2:16	54, 99, 104
2:17	71n, 99, 104
2:18	71n
2:19	71n
2:21–22	97–98, 98n
3:1	123
3:2	153–156, 154n
3:3	95
3:3–4	72–73
3:4	117, 153, 154n
3:5	53, 87–88, 103
3:6	208
3:7	66
3:7–8	66
3:8	66, 154, 197n
3:10	95
3:11	208n
3:12	208n

3:14	123	7:6	74n
3:15	50	7:9	118n
3:16	50, 123, 126n	7:10	202
3:18	99, 104, 120, 124n	7:11	202
3:19	120, 196	7:12	202
3:20	196, 196n	7:14	126n
3:21	121	7:16	120
3:22	121n, 130	7:19	74n
4:2	92–93, 95, 123	8:3	118n
4:4	118n, 123n	8:10	103
4:7	103	8:12	120
4:8	126	8:13	202
4:8–9	74n	8:14	89–90
4:11	129	8:16	130n
4:12	197	8:21	120n, 129
4:13	151–153, 151n	8:22	64, 65, 65n, 103
4:14	201	8:28	130
4:15	80–81, 103, 126	9:1	71n
4:17	95	9:2	87–88, 103
4:18–21	196n	9:3	127
4:21	201	9:3–7	75, 103
4:22–26	191–193	9:4	129n
4:27	50	9:7	130n
4:28	208n	9:8	120
5:1	120, 145–147	9:20	82–83, 103, 193–194
5:2	208n	9:21	95, 196
5:3	120	9:22–23	129n
5:6	197, 198, 199, 199n, 200n	9:24	157–159
5:7	82–84, 103	9:25	73
5:9	130n	9:26	71n
5:10	95, 198n	9:28–34	120n
5:13	198n	9:28	120n
5:14	198–200	9:31	120n
5:15	198n	9:32	120n
5:19	198–200	9:34	120n
5:22	124, 201	10:2	208n
6:1	127	10:5	102n
6:4	201	10:8	121n
6:6	50, 118n, 201–202	10:11	77–78, 103
6:7	202	10:13	127n
6:8	118n	10:16	95
6:12	52, 98–99, 126	10:19	89–90
6:15–25	95–96	10:25	146
6:26	90, 104	10:29	130n
6:27	92–93	11:1	129
7:1	126	11:2	202
7:3	99, 201, 207	11:3	202
7:4	90, 92–93	11:9–10	207
7:5	207	12:1	95

12:3	202–203	15:1–21	130
12:5	100–102, 104	15:1	54, 131, 133, 133n, 165–167
12:7	130n	15:2	131
12:11	130n, 209	15:3	131
12:12–27	103	15:4	132
12:12–13	88–89	15:5	132
12:13	203	15:6	132–133
12:14–15	188	15:7	132
12:14	187	15:9	132–133
12:16	118n	15:10	132–133
12:17	187	15:11	133
12:19	127n	15:16	132–133
12:21	88–89, 95, 121n	15:19	133
12:22	123	15:20–21	143n
12:23	88–89	15:20	133
12:24	188n	15:21	133, 133n
12:25	188	15:22	74n
12:26–27	88–89	15:23	68–69, 70, 103
12:26	188n	15:27	38, 39n
12:29	126	16:4	89–90
12:34	129n	16:13	124
12:38	203	16:15	68–69, 70, 103, 194
12:39	54, 120n, 203	16:22	92n
12:41	209	16:31	203
12:42	209	16:36	126
12:43	89n, 188n, 209	17:1	204
12:48	118n, 209	17:3	95, 121n
12:48–49	209n	17:11	74, 103
12:49	188n	17:13	50
13:5	188n	17:16	130n
13:6	119n	18:3–4	69–70
13:7	73–74, 84–86	18:5	126
13:9	188n	18:7	129
13:10	129n, 188n	18:8	197n
13:17	103	18:9	197n
13:18	52	18:10	197
13:21	203	18:14	202
14:2	127	18:16	129n
14:4	208n	18:18	65, 103
14:5	193, 197	18:19	204
14:7	132n	18:20	188n
14:11	197	18:21	204
14:13	140–143	19:2	74n
14:19	75–76	19:5	209, 210
14:20	119n	19:12–13	129
14:25	193n	19:13	204
14:27	86, 103, 130n, 193n	20:5	195
14:30	197n	20:14	168–170
14:31	141, 142	20:17	169n

20:18	96–97, 104	26:6	99
20:22–23:19	189	26:12	91–92
20:22	204–205	26:24	51
21:5	80–81, 95, 103	26:29	159, 205
21:6	51, 130n	27:1	205
21:7	130n	27:6	64, 103
21:8	129n	27:8	78–79
21:12–13	188–190	27:9	79
21:12	189n	28:14	100–102, 104
21:17	50	28:17–20	124
21:20–21	187	28:22	100–102, 104
21:20	190	28:23–28	118
21:22–25	170–172	28:24	100–102, 104
21:24–25	187n	28:30	130n
21:28	82n	29:5	92n
21:33	118n	29:9	205–206
22:2	190–191, 197	29:26	206
22:5	121n	29:28	206
22:6	38, 50	29:30	130n
22:18	121n	29:43	118n
22:22–23	74n	30:23	126
23:2	91–92	31:3	129n
23:7	129	31:13	208
23:8	126n	31:17	208
23:11	196	32:4	157
23:21	130n	32:8–9	200
23:22	77	32:12	129n
23:25	51	32:18	130n, 194n
23:30	90n	32:34	156–157
24:1	79–80, 103	33:7	172–175
24:3	95	34:2	99
24:6	127	34:4	206
24:9	79–80, 103	34:6	54
24:16–17	96–97	34:6–7	129n
24:17	104	34:11	51
25:4–5	127, 129n	34:31	206
25:6	127	35:1	206
25:7	130n	35:4	206
25:8	118n	35:16	189n
25:10	86–87, 103	36:8	127
25:11	129n	36:27	67, 68, 103
25:12	127n	37:6	205
25:17–18	205	38:7	78–79
25:22	205	38:25	127
25:29	130n	39:3	100–102, 104
25:30	126	39:6	84, 103
26:1	160–161, 205	39:14	84, 103
26:4	100–102, 104	39:18–21	100–102, 104
26:5	91–92	40:4	82–83

Leviticus

8:8	50
10:27	52
11:19	52
11:29	163n
11:41–43	163n
13:25	54
13:39	54
13:43	54
13:45	53
15:13	53
18:26	54
19:31	53
22:13	54
23:3	51
23:5	51
23:6	52
23:21	52
23:24	53
23:41	146
25:32	50n

Numbers

1:47	50n
3:47	52
3:49	50n
3:9	50n
5:24	50
6:12	54
13:20	54
13:21	51
14:4	51
16–18	96
16:13	52
24:7	54
24:9	51
25:8	52
33:9	38, 39n
35:16–25	189

Deuteronomy

1:14	93n
1:27–30	67n
1:30	141n
11:2	141n
11:3–4	141
7:22	53, 90n
9:11	206
16:9	38, 51

18:21	51–52
23:26	38, 51
28:50	51
32:36	50
33:23	50

Joshua 23

Judges 23
20:21 40, 40n
20:25 38, 40, 40n

Ruth 23

1 Kings 23, 23n
19:5 160

Chronicles 21, 23

Ezra 23

Nehemiah 23
9:9–11 141

Esther 23

Job 21, 39n
29:18 38, 39n

Psalms 23, 23n, 25, 30, 31, 36n, 41
77:15–20 141
77:25 194
106:21–22 141–142
134:4 210

Proverbs 23

Ecclesiastes 23

Song of Songs 23

Isaiah 23n
9:6 153
15:1 181
49:5 110
54:9 149
66:15 149
66:16 149

Jeremiah

8:18	78
9:21	66n
32:2	71n

Ezekiel

47:9	163n
------	------

Hosea

4:15	40n
------	-----

Amos

4, 6	
3:2	111
4:5	7n
5:25	146, 147
6:1	7n

Jonah

4:6	19n, 177
-----	----------

Habakkuk

3:14	16n, 85
------	---------

Zephaniah

3:18	38, 151n
------	----------

Zechariah

48

2. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha**Tobit**

21	
4:10–11	27
12:8–9	27

Wisdom

18:5	143
------	-----

Sirach

50:12	38, 39n
-------	---------

2 Maccabees

3:24	142n
------	------

Ezekiel the

Tragedian	144, 145
16	144n

3. New Testament**Matthew**

6:10	172
6:21	17n
26:31	49
27:9–10	48

Mark

5:41	48
------	----

Luke

1:49	142n
------	------

Acts

7:1–53	157
7:21	144

Romans

7:6	169n
7:7	169, 169n

1 Corinthians

10:1–2	142n
--------	------

Galatians

3:3	49n
-----	-----

Titus

3:9	64
-----	----

4. Rabbinic Texts**Gen. Rab.**

19:5	39n
25:5	76n

Exod. Rab.

2:5	154, 154n
2:8	154n
5:18	199n

Mekhilta

22	
Beshalah 4	76n
Beshallah	
Shirah 1	167
Bo 4	102n
Yitro	170n

Yitro,	
parashat 8	169–170, 170n
Mekhilta de R. Ishmael	
Neziqin 8	171
Mishnah	
Avot 5:4	141–142
Num. Rab. 15.20	199
Tosefta	
Sotah 3:13	148n
Talmud	
b. B. Qam.	
83b–84a	172n
b. Ber. 28a	38n
b. Ber. 63b	174, 174n
b. Hag. 10b	146, 146n
b. Sanh. 102a	157n
b. Sanh. 108b	39n
b. Sotah 11a	149–150
b. Sotah 11b	165n
Midrash	
Otzar	
Hamadrashim	159n
Passover	
Hagaddah	141–142
Pesiq. Rab Kah. 1:4	158
Pesiq. Rab.	
84	154n
21.14	168n
Pirke R. El. 40	151, 151n, 154n, 155
Tanhuma	
Beha'alotecha 13	199n
Tanhuma Buber	
Gen 25	160n

5. Greek and Roman Texts

Aelius Donatus

Ars Maior

II	183n
II.7	183n
II.12	183n
II. 15	183n
II.8	184n
III	183n
III.4.9	183n
III.4.16–17	183n
III.5.9	183n
III.5.10	183n
III.5	183n
III.14	184n
III.8	184n

Ars Minor

4	195n
9	184n

Commenti

Donatiani

Ad Terenti

Fabulas 179n

Ambrose

De fuga saeculi 165, 165n

Ambrosiaster

Commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas

Rom 1:4 141–142n

Quaestiones

Veteris et Novi

Testamenti 184–185, 187

14 195n

16 192

20 194n

42 154–155, 155n

Apuleius

Metamorphoses

10.21.10 81n

Aristotle

Poetica

154b 208n

Augustine

De civitate Dei

4.34 162n

18.43 177n

De scriptura sancta speculum

c. 59 190

Epistulae

71.5 177n

*Quaestiones et**Locutiones in**Heptateuchum* 171–172, 171n, 172n

3 153n

Sermones

52,9–10 116n

Basil of Caesarea

Enarrationes in Isaiam

7.187 152, 152n

Bede

In Pentateuchum Commentarii

91.310 142n

Catena in Exodum

628 189n

629 189n

636–640 171n

Catullus

51 199n

Cicero

De divinatione

2.35.75 205

De natura deorum

2.3.7 207n

In Catalinam

4.11 39

De republica

2.31.54 206

Tusculanae disputationes

4.11 169

Clement

1 *Clement*

51:5 142n

Clement of Alexandria

Stromateis

7.18.109.1 163, 163n

*Collatio Legum**Romanarum**et Mosaicarum* 184–187

I.i–xiii 189

I.vi.1 189n

III.i–iv 190

VII.i–v 191

VII.i.1 186n

VII.ii.1 191n

VII.iv.1 191n

*Constitutiones**Apostolorum* 157

Cyprian

Epistulae

79.7 142n

Didymus the Blind

De Trinitate

2.14 142n

*Epistle of**Barnabas* 157

2:6 147n

Grammatici latini

4.376 80n

Gregory of Nyssa

In Diem Luminum 142n

Horace

Epistulae

2.2.89 86n

Irenaeus

Adversus haereses

4.33–34 147n

Isidore of Seville

Etymologies

6.45 1

Jerome

Adversus Rufinum

1.16 182n

1.20 70n

2.34 107, 114n

4.15.2 142n

<i>Altercatio</i>		20.5.1	184n
<i>Luciferiani et</i>		22	180
<i>Orthodoxi</i>	18n	22.30	17n, 18n, 136n, 78–179, 178n
<i>Commentarius in Ecclesiasten</i>		22.30	181n
2	112n	22.41	133n, 143n
<i>Commentarioli</i>		29.6	160–161, 160n, 161n
<i>in Psalmos</i>	31n, 210, 210n	32.1	107n, 110n, 111
<i>Commentarius in Amos</i>		36	174
3:2	111n	36.10–14	124
<i>Commentarius in Daniele</i>		36.11	125n
11.17	184n	36.12	111, 125n
<i>Commentarius in Ezechielem</i>		36.13	125n
3.5	110	52.6.3	203
10.32.17	47n	53.10	181n
<i>Commentarius in Epistulam ad Galatas</i>		57	12, 34n, 45, 47, 49, 61, 62n
<i>Praef.</i>	178n	57.5–10	56n
1.3	49n	57.5	45n, 47
2.3	49n	57.5.2	47, 87, 79n
3.5	169n	57.6.3	46
3.19–20	87n	57.9	49
3.22	169n	57.11.2	49, 110n
<i>Commentarius in Habacuc</i>		60	27n
3:14	85	64	161n
<i>Commentarius in Isaiam</i>		69.6	142n
1.2	80n, 184n	73.9	136n
8:14	110n	78, v <i>mansio</i>	133n
49:5	111n	78.33	184n
<i>Commentarius</i>		84	21
<i>in Jeremiam</i>	26n	106	31, 41
31:37	81n	106.3.54–55	34n
8:16	81n	106.12	133
<i>Commentarius in Matthaeum</i>		106.86	128
6:11–13	210n	108	18n
<i>Commentarius in Osee</i>		121.5.7	172n
11:1	80n	121.8	168–169
<i>Commentarius in Nahum</i>		127.12	181
2:1	22		
<i>Commentarius</i>			
<i>in Zachariam</i>	31		
6:9–15	22		
<i>De nominibus</i>			
<i>Hebraicis</i>	20, 36n, 65n		
<i>prol.</i>	20n		
<i>De situ et nominibus</i>			
<i>locorum</i>			
<i>Hebraicorum</i>	20		
<i>De viris illustribus</i>			
135	16n		
<i>Epistulae</i>			
2.581	119		
		20.5.1	184n
		22	180
		22.30	17n, 18n, 136n, 78–179, 178n
		22.30	181n
		22.41	133n, 143n
		29.6	160–161, 160n, 161n
		32.1	107n, 110n, 111
		36	174
		36.10–14	124
		36.11	125n
		36.12	111, 125n
		36.13	125n
		52.6.3	203
		53.10	181n
		57	12, 34n, 45, 47, 49, 61, 62n
		57.5–10	56n
		57.5	45n, 47
		57.5.2	47, 87, 79n
		57.6.3	46
		57.9	49
		57.11.2	49, 110n
		60	27n
		64	161n
		69.6	142n
		73.9	136n
		78, v <i>mansio</i>	133n
		78.33	184n
		84	21
		106	31, 41
		106.3.54–55	34n
		106.12	133
		106.86	128
		108	18n
		121.5.7	172n
		121.8	168–169
		127.12	181
		<i>Liber Didymi de Spiritu Sancto</i>	
		52	142n
		<i>Onomastica</i>	41
		<i>Praef. Chron. Eus.</i>	110n
		<i>Praef. Comm. Ecc.</i>	114n
		<i>Prol. Dan.</i>	111
		<i>Praef. Ev.</i>	
		2–5	112–113n
		16–19	109, 109n
		<i>Praef. Iob</i>	16n, 63n, 111
		3	113n
		3–5	110n
		41	113n
		42–44	110n

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| 44–45 | 108n | 290e | 152n |
| <i>Praef. Jos.</i> | | 319d–e | 188 |
| 1 | 107n | | |
| 9–10 | 107n | Justin Martyr | |
| 11–12 | 122n | <i>Apologia</i> | |
| 18–22 | 113n | 30–53 | 147n |
| <i>Praef. Par.</i> | | 163 | 153n |
| 3–5 | 112n | <i>Dialogus cum Tryphone</i> | |
| <i>Praef. Ps.</i> | | 59–60 | 153n |
| IH 21–22 | 110 | | |
| IH 22–23 | 113n | <i>Letter of Aristeeas</i> | 9n, 43 |
| ILXX 13–14 | 112n | §302 | 44n |
| <i>Prol. Esr.</i> | 113–114 | §311 | 43n |
| 33–36 | 108n | | |
| 34–35 | 110n | Livy | |
| 39–44 | 114n | <i>Ab Urbe Condita</i> | |
| 42–44 | 116n | 10.13.1 | 85n |
| <i>Prol. Gal.</i> | 23n | 33.19.7 | 85n |
| <i>Prol. Hes.</i> | 56n, 106 | 42.12.5 | 123n |
| 8 | 113n | | |
| <i>Prol. Is.</i> | 113n | Lucan | |
| 20–21 | 110n | <i>Bellum Civile</i> | |
| <i>Prol. Par.</i> | 108n | 5.672 | 86n |
| <i>Prol. Pent.</i> | 23n, 33n, 44n, 150, 150n | | |
| 21 | 110 | Origen | |
| 24–25 | 110 | <i>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis</i> | |
| 8–11 | 107 | 6.14 | 152n |
| <i>Prol. Reg.</i> | 113n | <i>Contra Celsum</i> | |
| <i>Prol. Sal.</i> | 23n, 143n | v 59 | 193 |
| <i>Quaestiones</i> | | <i>Homiliae in</i> | |
| <i>Hebraicae ad</i> | | <i>Exodum</i> | 142n |
| <i>Genesim</i> | 2, 2n, 12, 20, 20n, 30, 30n,
31, 31n, 41, 115, 174n, 214 | <i>Homiliae in</i> | |
| | | <i>Josuam</i> | 142n |
| <i>Tractatus in Psalmos</i> | | <i>Homiliae in</i> | |
| 10 | 31n | <i>Lucam</i> | 20n |
| 95 | 31n | <i>Homiliae in</i> | |
| 109:3 | 86n | <i>Numeros</i> | 142n |
| | | | |
| Josephus | | Ovid | |
| <i>Antiquitates judaicae</i> | | <i>Heroides</i> | |
| 2.269 | 146n | 16.353 | 85n |
| 2.346 | 166n | <i>Tristia</i> | |
| | | 5.6.9 | 86n |
| | | | |
| Julian | | Paulinus of Nola | |
| <i>Contra Galilaeos</i> | 184, 186, 187 | <i>Epistulae</i> | |
| 106d–e | 195 | 24.18 | 142n |
| 152d | 186n | | |

Philo

De somniis

1.230 123n

De specialibus legibus

3.108–109 171n

De vita Mosis

1.10 144n

1.11 144n

1.12 144n

1.87 146n

2.25–44 44n

2.37 44n

2.37–38 79n

2.38 45n

Prosper of Aquitaine

Chronica 16n

Quintilian

Institutio oratoria

7.9.2–3 70n

9.2.2 78n

9.3.29 183n

9.3.81–86 75n

Rhetorica ad Herennium

4.28.38 183n

Seneca

Epistulae morales

91.5.5 85n

Naturales quaestiones

7.20.2 203

Servius

In Vergilii Aeneidem commentarii

1.1 167, 167n

14 179, 179n

1.96 80n

3.591 85

4.36 70

4.43 85n

4.242 123n

8.614 69

8.637 85–86

Terence

Andria

1–10 182n

12–18 182n

22–26 182n

28–32 182n

34–38 182n

41–42 182n

45 182n

51 182n

55 182n

57 182n

58 182n

61–63 182n

65 182n

67 182n

Tertullian

Ad uxorem

2.7 141n

Theodoret

162–163

*Catena of**Nicephorus* 164, 164n*Quaestiones in Exodum*

5 153n

19 148n

25 141n

Vergil

Aeneid 166

1.109 86

1.614 184n

2.361–65 181

4.242 123n

4.359 184n

6.144 123n

6.336 86

6.76 167n

7.698 167n

8.637–8 85

Appendix Vergiliana, Ciris

402 86n

Eclogae

3.86 179, 179n

7.5 167

Index of Subjects

- Aaron 50, 78–80, 92–93, 95–96, 121, 145, 201, 202, 205, 206, 207, 208n
- Abaye 146, 147n
- Aelius Donatus 16, 26n, 80, 166n, 179, 182n, 183, 184
- Akiva school 110
- Alexandria 43, 107n
- Alexandrian tradition 7n, 10, 61, 173
- Amalek 74
- ambiguitas* 70n, 72, 75, 78, 88n
- Ambrose 16, 21, 122n, 165
- Ambrosiaster 154–155, 184n, 185, 192, 194
- Antioch 17, 17n, 18n, 19, 136
- Antiochene tradition 2, 21, 151, 165n
- Apollinarianism 18
- Apollinaris of Laodicea 18n, 21, 114n
- Aquila 2, 13, 20, 24, 36n, 49, 52, 55, 73, 104, 105–111, 113, 115, 115n, 116n, 118n, 119, 124–125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 139, 158n, 162, 162n, 164n, 210, 214
- aretalogy 208
- Arianism 18
- Aristotle 16
- ark 127n, 174
- asceticism 18–19, 26, 27n, 135, 218
- assonance 86–87
- Augustine 15, 19n, 21, 34, 154, 155–156, 171, 173, 190
- Bar Haninas 24n, see also Baranina
- Baranina 21 see also Bar Haninas
- Basil of Caesarea 152
- Bethlehem 18–19, 18n, 135
- Blessilla 18
- book production, material dimensions 26–27
- burning bush 117, 153–156, 196, 208
- Caecilius 48
- Caesarea 19
- Catilinian conspiracy 40
- cherubim 160–161, 205
- Christ 151–154, 157, 208n
- Christian scholarship 21
- Christology 151–154, 156, 208
- Cicero 16, 32, 40, 47–48, 95, 168, 169n, 181n, 182, 184n, 198n, 207
- circumcision 191–193
- clarifications 51–52, 63, 83, 92n, 95, 102, 170, 190
- Classical tradition
 - grammatical/philological 2, 16, 26n, 30, 30n, 31n, 41, 53, 158–159, 167, 174
 - literary/exegetical 1, 16, 17, 26, 28n, 31n, 32, 36, 36n, 37, 37n, 39–40, 41, 42, 48, 55, 58, 71, 105, 106, 134, 136, 137, 137n, 138, 139, 139n, 140, 143–144, 166, 168, 169, 174–175, 176–212, 214, 220
- consonance 86–87
- Constantine 211, 217
- Constantinople 18, 18n, 19
- Dalmatia 16
- Damasus 18, 124, 174, 185n
- Didymus 21, 31, 32, 137
- Diocletian 217
- Diodore of Tarsus 21, 164
- Diomedes 63
- discourse analysis 9
- disassociation 169n
- Egypt 10, 17, 43, 66, 67, 71, 75, 76, 76n, 86, 120, 121, 124, 130, 140, 141, 142, 142n, 148, 150, 154, 163, 164, 193, 193n, 194, 196, 197, 198n, 199, 200, 202, 207, 208n, 209, 211
- Eleazer 96
- Eliezer 69–70
- Elijah 152n
- emendatio* 62, 63, 63n, 73, 74, 89–102, 103, 129
- enarratio* 62, 63, 63n, 65, 67–70, 79, 103
- Epiphanius of Salamis 21
- equivalence 3, 6, 6n, 10, 11, 13, 46, 57, 63, 63n, 70, 72n, 78, 79, 80, 82, 89, 117, 126, 149, 159, 212n
- etiology 4, 70
- etymology 3, 6, 24, 49, 50, 51, 63, 70, 108n, 110, 111n, 118n, 130, 132n, 149, 160, 160n, 163, 194, 205, 210, 211
- euphemism 53
- Eusebius of Caesarea 21
- Eusebius of Emesa 21, 151
- Eustochium 18, 113n, 143n

- Evagrius 17
 expansive rendering 14, 29, 69, 165
 explicitation 10, 11n, 65n, 68

 firstborn
 in reference to Christ 152
 in Exodus 192–193
 formal equivalency 10 *see also* isomorphism
 free translation 2, 3, 4, 7, 7n, 11, 13, 42, 49n,
 59, 61, 103, 213

 genre 59, 101, 139, 166
 Geruchia 172
glossemata 63, 67, 68, 69, 79, 92, 92n, 103,
 149, 169, 205, 207
 Golden Calf 156–157, 173, 194n, 200
 Greek tradition 14, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 24n, 25,
 25n, 28, 35–36, 36n, 38, 38n, 41, 52, 58,
 62, 68, 89, 90, 95, 101, 105, 106, 107–108,
 112, 114, 128–133, 139, 148, 149, 162, 165,
 173, 176, 207, 208n
 Gregory of Nazianzus 18, 21
 Gregory of Nyssa 18, 21

 Hadrian 189
 Ham 51, 141
 hapax legomena 4
 Hebraism 50–51, 53, 57, 90, 90n, 103
 Hexapla 13, 19, 24n, 25, 25n, 31n, 36n, 41,
 107–108, 108n, 111n, 127, 127n
 Hilary of Poitiers 45, 196
historia 30n, 63, 63n, 83–84, 85, 103, 157–167,
 175
 Homer 48, 173
 homicide 187, 187n, 189–190
 homoioteleuton 127
 Horace 181n, 182
 hyperbaton 47, 87, 183
 hypotaxis 2n, 94, 99, 181, 183, 183n

 idiom 4, 6, 34, 50, 52–53, 65, 68, 71, 78, 79,
 80, 86, 90, 92, 93, 93n, 102, 111n, 130, 182,
 183, 191, 196, 197, 197n, 200, 207, 211, 212
 intertextuality 52, 178–179, 196–197
 involuntary manslaughter 189
 Isidore of Seville 1
 isomorphism 10 *see also* formal equivalency
iudicium 62, 63
iuxta Septuaginta 105, 142

 Jerusalem 7n, 17, 18n, 43, 77n
 Jewish tradition 1, 12, 13, 19–23, 24n, 25n, 26,
 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33n, 35n, 36, 36n, 37,
 38, 38n, 39, 39n, 41, 42, 55, 56, 58, 105,
 106, 110, 115, 134, 135, 136, 137, 137n, 138,
 139, 139n, 140, 140n, 142, 143, 144, 145,
 145n, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 152n, 153, 154,
 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 165, 167,
 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 172n, 173, 175, 176,
 177, 179, 199, 214, 220–221 *see also*
 rabbinic tradition
 John Chrysostom 136
 Josephus 145–146, 166, 171
 judaizing 29, 110, 111, 138
 Julian 16n, 152, 180, 184, 186, 188, 195

 Korah 96

langue 8
 Latin tradition
 grammatical/philological 14, 15, 41, 42,
 59, 60, 61–64, 66, 70, 80, 82, 85, 88, 92,
 102, 103, 105, 167, 176, 183
 literary/exegetical 15, 36, 36n, 41, 53, 54,
 65, 95, 97, 98, 114, 116, 142, 177, 179, 182,
 185, 191–195, 196, 212, 214, 221
 legal 187–191
 Latinism 14, 51, 71, 90, 98, 99, 195–196, 197
lectio 62, 64–67, 103, 160n, 186n, 206
Leitwort 88
 lengthening 10–11, 11n
 Levite 124, 201
lex talionis 171, 172n, 187n
 lexical patterning 10, 11n
 lexicology 5, 46, 47
 literal translation 2, 3, 3n, 6, 12, 29n, 42, 45,
 48, 50, 51, 56, 58, 101, 197
 liturgical use, effect on translation
 technique 41

 manna 194, 204
 Marah 69–70
 Marcella 18, 19n, 160
 Marius Victorinus 16
 Masoretic Text 2, 12, 43n, 103, 106, 117, 127,
 127n, 129, 149, 159
 Miriam 133, 167
 Moab 181
 monasticism 17, 18, 26, 26n, 146, 216

- morphology 5, 46, 48, 79–80, 94n, 205
- Moses 23, 64, 68, 72, 73, 74, 78, 79, 80, 87, 88, 92, 93, 95, 97, 98, 99, 117, 120, 123, 130, 130n, 131, 140, 143, 144, 145, 146, 151, 152, 152n, 153, 153n, 154, 156, 157, 165–166, 167, 167n, 172, 173, 174, 186, 186n, 188n, 191, 192, 192n, 193, 197, 200, 201, 202, 204, 206, 206n, 207, 208n, 210, 211
- Nile 148, 198
- non-obligatory shift 10, 103
- number 64, 70, 80, 81, 103, 183, 183n
- obligatory shift 10, 103
- Oea 177
- Oedipus 144
- Old Latin 1, 2, 2n, 12, 13, 20n, 37, 50, 52, 53, 104, 112, 122, 139, 143, 160, 166, 173, 186, 214 *see also* Vetus Latina
- oral tradition 145, 146
- orality 10
- Origen 13, 18, 18n, 19, 21, 23, 24, 24n, 25n, 31n, 33n, 107–108, 108n, 114, 115, 133n, 152n, 173
- Origenist controversy 19, 19n
- orthography 128
- pagan 136, 138, 139, 144, 145, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 180, 180n, 181, 181n, 182, 184, 184n, 185, 185n, 186n, 187, 192, 193, 193n, 194, 194n, 195, 206, 212, 219, 221
- Pammachius 19n
- Pannonia 16
- parallelism 6, 76, 77, 129, 183, 183n
- paranomasia 206
- paraphrase 63, 68, 90, 101, 102, 106, 116, 127, 186
- parataxis 34n, 53, 94, 95, 98, 98n, 99, 118n, 123n
- parole* 8, 8n
- Passover 188n, 209
- Paul 17, 49, 49n, 169, 170
- Paula 18, 18n, 113n
- Paulus 190, 191n
- Pentateuch 12, 23, 31, 36n, 40, 41, 43, 50, 51, 53, 107, 107n, 116
- periphrasis 51, 65, 72, 82–83, 85, 103, 164, 183, 193, 197n, 203
- Pharaoh 78, 83, 88, 93, 98, 99, 120, 126, 141, 144, 145, 148, 163, 164, 165, 191, 192, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200n, 201, 202, 207, 208n
- Philo 24n, 43, 44, 104, 145–146, 160n, 171, 173
- philology 2, 6, 13–14, 28, 30, 30n, 31n, 36, 36n, 41, 46, 48–49, 53, 60, 61, 102, 105, 137n, 162, 215, 218
- Phinehas 151, 151n, 152n
- plagues 52, 102n, 141–142, 148, 158, 207, 208
- Plautus 48, 181n
- polyvalence 46, 142n, 207
- Procopius 149, 162–163
- Prophets 7, 23, 23n, 52, 112, 146, 147
- Psalms 23, 23n, 25, 30, 31, 35n, 36n, 37n, 41, 45, 110, 142, 209 *see also* Psalter
- Psalter 25, 28, 30, 31n *see also* Psalms
- Ptolemy II 43, 107, 150
- Puah 164
- pun 38n, 70, 88, 88n, 160, 194
- quaestiones* 20, 20n, 124n, 173–175
- qualitative analysis 3n, 4
- quantitative analysis 3, 3n, 4, 6
- R. Eliezer 154, 167, 174
- R. Judah 76n, 158n, 174
- R. Nehemiah 158, 158n, 167, 174
- R. Papa 146, 147n
- R. Yehoshua 154, 155
- R. Yose Ha-Gelili 141
- R. Judah Hanasi 169–170
- rabbinic tradition 2, 6, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 29n, 30, 31, 31n, 34n, 36, 37, 41, 42, 55, 76n, 102, 114, 134, 139, 140n, 141, 142, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150n, 151, 154, 167, 172, 174, 175, 199n, 214, 216, 219 *see also* Jewish tradition
- recentiores* 2, 12, 20, 24n, 31n, 105, 107, 108, 108n, 109, 110, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 126, 127, 128, 130, 134, 143, 214 *see also* Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion
- recentiores*-rabbinic philology 2, 13, 15–42, 105, 114, 115, 134, 175, 212, 213, 214
- reception criticism 1, 8, 9, 14, 138, 176, 177, 214
- Red Sea 130, 140–143, 142n, 143n, 148, 208n
- recognition scenes 207–208, 208n

- regularity of performance 11, 212n
 regularity of system 11, 212n
 repetition 11, 40n, 50, 53, 71n, 72, 76, 78, 88,
 90n, 94, 133, 148, 170, 183n, 196
 rhetoric 6n, 16, 17, 25, 27n, 33, 36, 36n, 47,
 71, 75, 75n, 77, 83, 85, 87, 92, 124n, 136,
 137n, 158n, 179n, 182n, 183n, 201, 216, 219
 Roman law 186, 189, 191, 206, 211
 Rome 16, 18, 19, 27, 85, 135, 180, 181
 Rufinus 17, 21, 24n

 S-universals 11, 11n, 176n
 Samaritans 7, 7n
 Sapir-Whorf hypothesis 59n, 93
 segmentation 6
 semantics 24n, 48, 49, 51, 65, 66, 71–74, 78,
 82, 90, 102, 115n, 117, 124, 129, 131, 164
 see also *variatio*
 sense-for-sense (*ad sensum*) translation 45,
 47, 48, 49, 49n, 50, 182
sensus 45–49, 80, 109, 109n, 182, 106n
 Septuagint 2, 4, 5, 5n, 8–13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24n,
 29, 30n, 32, 33n, 36n, 37, 37n, 38, 38n,
 39, 39n, 41, 43, 44, 46, 48, 52, 55, 61, 63n,
 78, 82, 104, 105–134, 137n, 139, 144, 146,
 150, 151, 160, 164, 171, 177n, 193, 194, 195,
 200, 200n, 201, 202, 213, 214
 Servius 68, 69, 70, 80, 85, 86, 166, 166n, 167,
 179
 Severus of Antioch 153n, 156
 Shifrah 164
 simplification 11n, 100–102, 104
 Sinai 97, 99, 173
 Sofronius 110, 113n
 source language 8, 8n, 10, 46, 53, 55, 57, 57n,
 58, 58n, 59, 63n, 65, 66, 71, 72, 74, 79, 82,
 93
 source text 4, 6, 8, 8n, 10, 11, 12, 33, 34, 46, 51,
 68, 75, 138, 141, 176n
 standardization 11, 11n
 statistical analysis 3, 5, 7, 7n
 Stridon 16
 style 6n, 8, 10, 34n, 35n, 37n, 46, 48, 49, 52,
 53, 63, 65, 66, 71, 80, 88, 90, 92n, 94, 95,
 98, 99, 103, 104, 109, 110, 110n, 112, 113n,
 115, 116n, 118, 124, 128, 129, 130, 132, 133,
 134, 180, 182, 183n, 196, 212

 subordination 53, 53n, 66, 86, 94–95, 98n,
 99, 104, 164n *see also* *hypotaxis*
 substitution 101, 107
 subtraction 3, 32, 34n, 101, 117, 118–119
 see also *simplification*
 Symmachus 2, 13, 20, 24, 36n, 52, 55, 73, 104,
 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 109n, 110, 111, 111n,
 113, 113n, 114n, 115, 115n, 119, 125, 126, 127,
 129, 130, 139, 158, 162, 163, 164, 164n, 210,
 214
 syntax 5, 6, 36n, 51, 52, 53n, 54, 63, 66n, 67,
 70, 71, 72, 72n, 73, 75, 77, 79, 80, 80n, 82,
 86, 89, 90, 93, 94, 98, 99, 102, 103, 115n,
 116, 117, 117n, 118, 118n, 119, 120, 120n, 121,
 121n, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 131, 133, 145n,
 149, 158n, 159, 183, 183n
 Syria 7, 17, 18n, 21
 Syro-Hexapla 73

 T-universals 11, 11n, 176n
 Tabernacle 68, 78, 84, 91, 92, 102, 103, 127,
 159, 160, 161, 205
 target language 4, 8, 8n, 10, 11n, 12, 33n, 46,
 53, 54, 55, 57, 57n, 58, 58n, 59, 63n, 65,
 71, 72, 79, 81, 82, 93, 98, 102, 176, 176n,
 197, 213
 target text 3, 4, 8, 8n, 57, 68, 75, 102, 176, 176n
 target translation 46
 Targum 22, 28, 29, 29n, 41, 42, 76, 151, 152n,
 165, 165n, 202
 Tent of Meeting 172–173, 174
teraphim 160, 161n
 Terence 16, 48, 179, 181n, 182, 198n
 Tertullian 27n, 196n
 textual criticism 4, 5, 12, 54, 63, 89, 109, 147
 see also *emendatio*
 Theodoret of Cyrrhus 148, 153n, 156,
 162–163, 173
 Theodotian 2, 13
 theology 5, 6n, 7, 7n, 12, 36, 47n, 133, 137, 138,
 147–157, 162, 167, 172–175, 201
 Torah 43, 138, 146, 174
 transliteration 6, 36n, 50, 52, 65n, 112, 118,
 126, 127
 Trier 17, 17n, 18n
 trope 36, 36n, 77, 85, 86, 103, 150, 181, 221
 Twelve Tablets 206

- Ulpian 189–190
- universals 10–12, 54, 59n, 103 *see also*
S-universals, T-universals
- Valeria 211
- variatio* 6n, 13, 32, 52, 53, 53n, 65, 71–77, 78,
83, 84, 87, 103, 110, 121, 127, 129, 131, 148,
168, 169, 183, 196, 196n, 197, 197n, 201,
202, 205, 206, 208
- verbs
aspect 59n, 81
tense 32, 34n, 59n, 70, 81, 81n, 94n, 103,
120, 123, 142, 143, 183
- Vergil 16, 86, 167, 179, 181, 181n, 184n
- Vetus Latina 19, 21, 55, 63n, 105, 106, 112, 112n,
115, 115n, 116, 117, 119, 121–124, 127, 128,
130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 137n, 169, 191, 201,
202, 203 *see also* Old Latin
- word order 3, 6, 47, 48, 49, 53n, 55n, 63n, 87,
118, 122, 131, 183
- wordplay 54, 86, 88, 88n, 212
- word-for-word (*ad verbum*) translation 34n,
45, 46, 47n, 49, 61, 94, 184
- Zipporah 98, 191–193

Index of Words

1. Hebrew

א.ה.ב.	81
או	129
אוח	50, 126
אין	7n, 51
איש	80
א.מ.ר.	51, 53, 71n, 98, 130, 200
בדים	64
ב.ו.א.	71n, 72, 72n, 126
בור	118n
בית	51, 203n
בן	84, 120
בת	120
גדול	93
גר	118n, 127n, 212
ג.ו.ר.	52, 201
ד.ב.ר.	81, 93
דבר	51, 66n, 120, 120n, 188n, 201
ו	94, 95
ז.ב.ח.	65
ח.ג.ח.	145–147
חול	38, 39n, 53
חיה	77, 164, 164n
חמץ	74
חמשים	52, 124–125
חוק	187, 188n
י.ד.ע.	66
ילד	71n
ים	50, 68
כי ידעתי	66
כרבים	160–161
לא	74n
לב	51, 99
לכן	118n
מדבר	74n
מופת	207, 207n
מסע	204
מעט מעט	53, 90n
מקנה	75, 205
מ.ר.ר.	51, 82
נבל	66
נ.ג.ע.	52, 129–130

נוגי	38, 38n
נוגש	198n, 199, 200n
נ.ס.ע.	76
נתחכמה	148
סגולה	209
ס.ו.ר.	72
ע.ב.ד.	188n
עולם	51, 188n
עם	118, 202
ע.נ.ה.	74n, 148
ערל שפתיים	52, 126
ע.ש.ה.	74n, 78, 79, 81, 118n, 197n, 209, 211n
פסח	51, 88, 209
פ.ק.ד.	50, 123
קול	74n, 126
ק.ו.ם	38
ק.נ.ה.	75
שאר	74
שבת	51
שדה	73
ש.ט.ר.	197, 198n
ש.י.ם	129, 143
ש.י.ר.	131
ש.ל.ח.	120, 196
שלשיו	131
שופר	204
שרי מסים	119
ש.ר.ץ	52, 163
ת.א.ב.	65
תנין	202
ת.ע.ב.	65

2. Greek

α	126n
ἄβυσσος	132
αζυμα	74
ἀκριβασμα	188n
ἀκριβεια	187
ἀκρόβυστος	
χέλειςιν	126
ἀναγνώρισις	207
ἀντίθεσις	75n

ἀπερίτμητος τοῖς	
χείλεσιν	52, 126
ἀφήν	129
βέλτιστα	121n
βίβα	127
γάρ	66n, 164n
γωνιάσματα	127n
δέ	37, 94, 95n, 98n, 121n, 123
διβαφές	127
διπλοῦν	127
ἐγγχειρίδιον	204
εἰς	118n
ἔμφασις	78–79, 88n
ἐπεὶ	95
ἐπιστάται τῶν	
ἔργων	119
ἐργοδιώκται	119, 198n
ζηλωτής	195
ζητέω	120
ζητήσις	173
ζύμα	74
ἰδοῦ ἐγώ	118
ἱερουργέομαι	146
Ἰουδαῖοι	163
καί	94
κατασοφισώμεθα	149
κατωδύνων	82
κοῖλον σανιδωτόν	78
λάκκος	118n, 126, 133
λατρεύω	208n
λύσεις	173
μαῖαι	164n
μάχαιρα	204
νόμιμον	187, 188n
νομοθετέω	206
ὁ ὦν	123
ὀπλῖται	125
ὀστέινον	118
ὀψιμα	120n
περιούσιον	210
πλαγή	129
πλάξ	206
πλευράς	127n
ποιέω	81, 129, 209, 211
προσήλυτος	118n, 127n, 209
πρόσταγμα	187, 188n
πύξια	206
ράβδος	124n

ρόμφαία	204
σάλπιγξ	204
σκυλεύω	130
στάχys	38
συνάγω	193
τελειώσεις	206
ὕβριστικῶς	162–163
ὕποδεῖκνυμι	126, 206
φαρμακός	121n
Φίλαρωθ	127
φοίνιξ	39, 39n
φωτίσω	126
χυδαῖοι	162, 163

3. Latin

<i>absit a te</i>	53
<i>accentus</i>	64
<i>ad</i>	51, 82
<i>adhuc</i>	88
<i>adoptare</i>	211
<i>adsum</i>	118
<i>advena</i>	127, 212
<i>ager</i>	73, 75
<i>alter ad alterum</i>	51, 92
<i>altitudo</i>	86
<i>amara</i>	69
<i>amaritudo</i>	51, 70
<i>amicus</i>	202
<i>arca</i>	54
<i>arcum</i>	54
<i>armati</i>	52, 125
<i>aromata</i>	126
<i>ascensor</i>	54, 131, 133
<i>aspiratio</i>	64
<i>at</i>	53, 88, 96
<i>aut</i>	129
<i>autem</i>	95, 96, 97, 123, 189
<i>azyma</i>	52, 74
<i>bellum</i>	86
<i>brachium</i>	50
<i>bucina</i>	204
<i>caerimonia</i>	188n
<i>caminus</i>	120
<i>canere</i>	131, 166
<i>cantare</i>	131, 133, 166–167
<i>canticum</i>	131, 166
<i>carmen</i>	131, 166–167

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>cernere</i> | 72 | <i>Gersan</i> | 69, 70; see also Gersam |
| <i>cherubim</i> | 161, 205 | <i>Hebraei</i> | 29–30 |
| <i>cilicium</i> | 53 | <i>Hebraica veritas</i> | 1, 125, 129, 214 |
| <i>colere</i> | 64 | <i>hyperbatorum</i> | |
| <i>colonus</i> | 54, 209n | <i>anfractus</i> | 47 |
| <i>coluber</i> | 202 | <i>id est</i> | 68, 92, 92n, 205 |
| <i>confugere</i> | 193 | <i>ideo</i> | 118n |
| <i>congregare</i> | 83, 193 | <i>igitur</i> | 95, 123 |
| <i>congruus</i> | 69–70 | <i>in</i> | 50, 118n, 126n |
| <i>conservare</i> | 81 | <i>incircumcisis</i> | |
| <i>consurgere</i> | 85 | <i>labiis</i> | 52, 126 |
| <i>contentio</i> | 75n, 76, 77 | <i>interpretatio</i> | 138 |
| <i>contentiosius</i> | 111 | <i>iste</i> | 124, 133, 200–201 |
| <i>coturnix</i> | 124 | <i>itaque</i> | 95 |
| <i>crateraa</i> | 127 | <i>lacus</i> | 118n, 126 |
| <i>crimen</i> | 190 | <i>lamina</i> | 205 |
| <i>culter</i> | 204 | <i>laudare</i> | 166 |
| <i>cultus</i> | 187 | <i>legitimum</i> | 187 |
| <i>cum vi</i> | 127 | <i>lex</i> | 188n |
| <i>cynomuia</i> | 129 | <i>liberare</i> | 197 |
| <i>decanus</i> | 204 | <i>longius ne abeatis</i> | 130 |
| <i>diligere</i> | 81 | <i>lupanar</i> | 52 |
| <i>dimidium</i> | 87 | <i>magistri operum</i> | 119 |
| <i>dimittere</i> | 120n, 196 | <i>magnalia</i> | 141–142, 142n |
| <i>distinctio</i> | 66 | <i>maleficus</i> | 121n, 202 |
| <i>doctrina et veritas</i> | 50 | <i>manus</i> | 197, 197n |
| <i>domus</i> | 202–203 | <i>mansio</i> | 204 |
| <i>draco</i> | 202 | <i>mare</i> | 50, 126 |
| <i>ego</i> | 208 | <i>maxima</i> | 93, 198 |
| <i>egredi</i> | 40, 95 | <i>mediis fluctibus</i> | 86, 86n |
| <i>elegantia</i> | 48 | <i>mittere</i> | 120, 124 |
| <i>eloquens</i> | 201 | <i>mixtio</i> | 129 |
| <i>enim</i> | 164n | <i>mogilalum</i> | 129 |
| <i>eques</i> | 54, 133 | <i>mulier</i> | 202 |
| <i>ergo</i> | 95 | <i>muniti</i> | 125 |
| <i>et</i> | 66n, 94, 96, 124, 203 | <i>musca</i> | 129 |
| <i>exactor</i> | 197–200 | <i>ne</i> | 101 |
| <i>exercitum</i> | 90 | <i>ne forte</i> | 119 |
| <i>exponere</i> | 143–144 | <i>nugas</i> | 38, 38n |
| <i>facere</i> | 50, 51, 74n, 79, 81, 82, 129,
193, 197n | <i>opprimere</i> | 148–150 |
| <i>facies</i> | 51, 79 | <i>optimum</i> | 121n |
| <i>familia</i> | 202–203 | <i>oraculum</i> | 205 |
| <i>fermentatum</i> | 74 | <i>os</i> | 50, 197 |
| <i>fornax</i> | 120 | <i>ostendere</i> | 126, 188n |
| <i>germinare</i> | 162 | <i>ostenta</i> | 207 |
| <i>Gersam</i> | 97, 211, 212n; see also
Gersan | <i>otium</i> | 199n |
| | | <i>palma</i> | 38–39 |
| | | <i>panis propositionis</i> | 126, 194 |

<i>pariter</i>	76, 159
<i>partibor</i>	133
<i>peculium</i>	209–210
<i>peregrinatio</i>	201
<i>peregrinus</i>	118n, 209
<i>phase</i>	51, 89, 209
<i>plaga</i>	129
<i>plebs</i>	202
<i>pontifex</i>	52
<i>populus</i>	124, 133, 173, 202
<i>praeceptum</i>	71, 81, 83
<i>praeffectus</i>	198–200
<i>praeponere</i>	71n, 198n, 200
<i>proprie</i>	69
<i>proprietas</i>	47
<i>provectae aetatis</i>	53
<i>pulmentum</i>	52, 203
<i>quanto . . . tanto</i>	53
<i>quasi</i>	52, 131, 162–163
<i>quoque</i>	95
<i>religio</i>	88–89, 188n, 209
<i>reus</i>	190
<i>revertere</i>	71n, 196n
<i>rite</i>	83
<i>ritus</i>	187
<i>sabbatum</i>	51, 208
<i>sabulum</i>	53
<i>sacrificare</i>	145–146
<i>saeculum</i>	51
<i>sapienter</i>	148–149
<i>scire</i>	66, 66n, 207
<i>scientia</i>	160, 164
<i>sed</i>	37, 95, 121n
<i>seges</i>	38, 50
<i>sermo . . . verbum</i>	
. . . vox	74n

<i>signa</i>	50, 207–208
<i>significantius</i>	210
<i>significat</i>	69
<i>stare</i>	38, 50, 76, 119n, 131
<i>subcinericia</i>	
<i>azyma</i>	54, 120n
<i>synagoga</i>	206
<i>tabernaculum</i>	205
<i>tabulae</i>	206
<i>tangere</i>	129
<i>tanquam</i>	133
<i>tantum</i>	78
<i>transitus</i>	88, 89, 209
<i>tribunus</i>	204
<i>turba</i>	206
<i>turma</i>	90
<i>ut</i>	93n, 101, 133
<i>velle</i>	190, 197, 209
<i>villa</i>	202
<i>vir</i>	70n., 131, 202
<i>virago</i>	70n
<i>virga</i>	123
<i>visitare</i>	50, 123, 195
<i>vulgus</i>	203
<i>zelotes</i>	195

4. Aramaic

אורשינה	39n
גלעד	51
חכמין	165
טליתא קומי	48
יגר שהדותא	51